STEVE McCormick

DR. K. STEVE McCORMICK
EUROPEAN NAZARENE Bible College
POSTFACH 109
CH-8201 SCHAFFHAUSEN, SWITZERLAND

K. STEVE McCormick

THE HOLY SPIRIT
FROM
ARMINIUS TO WESLEY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/holyspiritfromar0000howa

THE HOLY SPIRIT
FROM
ARMINIUS TO WESLEY

A STUDY OF CHRISTIAN TEACHING CONCERNING THE HOLY SPIRIT AND HIS PLACE IN THE TRINITY IN THE SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES

BY
HOWARD WATKIN-JONES, B.D. (CANTAB.)

πνεῦμα ὁ Θεός, καὶ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας
αὐτὸν ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ δεῖ
προσκυνεῖν.

DR. K. STEVE McCORMICK
EUROPEAN NAZARENE Bible College
POSTFACH 109
CH-8201 SCHAFFHAUSEN, SWITZERLAND

LONDON
THE EPWORTH PRESS
J. ALFRED SHARP

Dissertation approved for the Degree of Doctor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.

TO

THE MEMBERS OF MY FAMILY,

AND TO

THE MEMORY OF MY FATHER

First Edition, 1929.

Made and Printed in Great Britian by
Hazell, Watson & Viney, Ld., London and Aylesbury.

PREFACE

THIS volume, which is a sequel to *The Holy Spirit in the Mediaeval Church* (published in 1922), continues the consideration of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. An historical survey of the period is given as an Introduction, various aspects of the subject itself being treated in the succeeding chapters, with occasional Appended Notes on modern developments.

I gratefully express my indebtedness to my father, the late Rev. R. Watkin-Jones, for several books bearing on Methodism, as well as for much gracious encouragement; to my friend, the Rev. G. R. Holt Shafto, for certain notes on Wesley's ordinations which have proved their usefulness after many years; to the Rev. C. A. Hall, of the New Church, for information regarding Swedenborgian doctrine; and to the Editor of *The Methodist Recorder*, for permission to reproduce part of an Interview with the late Dr. Charles Wenyon.

H. W-J.

EDINBURGH,
March, 1928.

'Fools imagine that the greatest authorities are always on the side of new and singular opinions; and that, by adopting them, they get themselves into better company than they have naturally any right to keep: and thus they are secretly worshippers of authority in that very act in which they pretend to fly in the face of it. . . . And where a secret consciousness of ignorance is not accompanied with the vain ambition of being thought wise; still an undue deference to private authority, in prejudice of established opinion, seems to be the side upon which even modest men are liable to err.'—SAMUEL HORSLEY.

CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION	11
II.	THE GODHEAD OF THE SPIRIT	55
III.	THE PLACE OF THE SPIRIT IN THE ABSOLUTE TRINITY	73
IV.	THE PLACE OF THE SPIRIT IN THE REDEMPTIVE TRINITY	107
V.	THE PROCESSION OF THE SPIRIT	117
VI.	THE PERSONAL LIFE OF THE SPIRIT	129
VII.	THE WORK OF THE SPIRIT IN CREATION	149
VIII.	THE WORK OF THE SPIRIT IN INSPIRATION	167
IX.	THE WORK OF THE SPIRIT IN THE INCARNATION	191
X.	THE MISSION OF THE SPIRIT	203
XI.	THE SPIRIT AND THE CHURCH	221
XII.	THE WORK OF THE SPIRIT IN THE SACRAMENTS	241
XIII.	THE SPIRIT AND THE HUMAN WILL	257
XIV.	THE WORK OF THE SPIRIT IN JUSTIFICATION	275
XV.	THE WORK OF THE SPIRIT IN SANCTIFICATION	287
XVI.	THE WITNESS OF THE SPIRIT	303
	LIST OF PRINCIPAL AUTHORITIES	323
	INDEX	327

'Take away the dispensation of the Spirit and His effectual operations in all the intercourse that is between God and man; be ashamed to avow or profess the work attributed unto Him in the Gospel, and Christianity is plucked up by the roots.'—JOHN OWEN.

I

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

I. Introductory
The Greek Church
Formula of Concord and Canons of Dort

II. Arminius and the Remonstrants
Calvinists of the Saumur School
Roman Catholic Theology

III. English Protestantism in the Early Seventeenth Century
The Cambridge Platonists

IV. Trinitarian Controversy in England (1st Stage)

V. Trinitarian Controversy in England (2nd Stage)

VI. Unitarian Controversy in England (1st Stage)

VII. Unitarian Controversy in England (2nd Stage)

VIII. Philosophical Movements
1. English Deism
2. Continental Philosophy
3. British Philosophy

IX. Mystical Movements—
1. Jansenism
2. Quietism
3. Quakerism
4. Swedenborgianism
5. Pietism

X. Wesley and Early Methodism

I

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

1

BETWEEN the years in which we live and the long period of the Middle Ages with its immediate results, there occur two centuries, the seventeenth and eighteenth, in which the foundations of modern theology take final shape. The process of their earlier shaping is evident particularly in the sixteenth century, when all the forces that combined to cause the Reformation turned attention in a new direction by asserting the principle of individuality and those aspects of spiritual truth which closely affect it. Divines, both Lutheran and Reformed, were then engaged in emphasizing justification by faith, and, in so doing, found it necessary to inquire into the doctrine of the Trinity experimentally, and to re-explore the whole region of the Spirit's saving operations. Mysticism and Socinianism, philosophical speculation and ecclesiastical authority, are also to reappear with new doctrines of their own for the individual life. Hence, in the course of these centuries, interest is largely centred in the Church's teaching concerning the Holy Spirit, and the relevant material available for the student is considerable. At the same time, this revival of interest meant a survival of former Church teaching as much as ever, and, to some extent, even a survival of the scholastic standpoint. Periods of development in religious thought are never quite clear cut—a fact which serves only to emphasize the continuity which lies underneath them. 'If,' said Chillingworth, 'you take the liberty to suppose what you please, you may very easily conclude what you list.'

In the early years of the seventeenth century we find theologians concerning themselves more with the essential Nature of the Holy Spirit than with His work, which is accounted for by the assertion, on the part of the followers of Arminius, of the subordination of the Spirit to the Father and the Son, and by their rejection of the Western dogma of

His procession from them both. On such points Arminius was orthodox enough, but so persistently did his disciples toy with Socinian beliefs that John Owen comes to brand them openly as a 'crew of Socinianized Arminians.' Glances eastwards reveal a similar emphasis on the Person of the Spirit in the Greek Church, where, no matter what be the stage of development in the West, there was never any lack of protagonists to attack the Western assumption of the *Filioque*. Yet even in dealing with such a question as the Procession, the Western writers of these centuries never substitute the abstruse for the mysterious. To them the *Filioque* is more than a metaphysical subject : indeed, orthodoxy, pietism, and rationalism join in discouraging them from merely metaphysical pursuits. Their constant insistence on the Holy Spirit as the Spirit of the Son serves to show their practical outlook on the relation of the Saviourhood of the Godhead to sinful man, while the East appears more concerned with what it rules to be hypostatic confusion. Therefore, after some years of defending the accepted doctrine of the Spirit's Person, the seventeenth-century Churchmen proceed to expound more freely His work in the human heart, as witness the inimitable passages which flowed from the pen of Richard Baxter.

A similar change of emphasis characterizes the eighteenth century. Within its limits attempts were made in certain quarters, in face of rationalistic philosophy and the discoveries of science, to present Christian theology in a more intellectually satisfying form, which meant allowing free play to reason and placing the mysterious at a discount. This self-imposed task was undertaken by such yoke-fellows as John Wallis, Samuel Clarke, and William Whiston, besides others who entered into their Unitarian heritage ; and it aroused a series of controversies concerning the Trinity and the Deity of the Third Person thereof which finally died down when Bengel published his *Gnomon*, and enjoyed but a brief resuscitation under the aegis of Joseph Priestley. The latter half of the century, however, sees the stress placed on the Spirit's work, consequent on the Evangelical Revival ; but it was on the work of the Spirit as the Spirit of Christ and of God, with all the breadth and depth of His saving operations. We emerge, therefore,

from the eighteenth century feeling not only that different aspects of the doctrine of the Spirit have received proper consideration in turn, but that they have also, in actual fact, been considered together, one truth at issue at any particular moment being supported by other truths relating to the same doctrine. Probably that is why such nineteenth-century theologians as Heber, Hare, and Arnold were enabled to make their contributions to the doctrine in a more even manner, and with a vision uncontracted by controversy. It will readily be seen, however, before ever the nineteenth century is reached, that the subject of the Divine Spirit touches every other subject which reacts on human experience; and it is necessary in consequence to trace not only the development of certain beliefs, but also the development of their religious values.

With regard to the conduct of the *Filioque* dispute, little need be said. The West, with the exception of the Arminian school, continues to make free use of Scripture in upholding the twofold and timeless procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son as from one Source, occasionally so forgetting itself as to chaff the East for really holding the same view! Needless to say, the East stands by its old position as the position of the Fathers, disallowing any procession in an eternal and metaphysical sense, and agreeing only to a temporal mission of the Spirit that has no connexion with questions of the essential unity of the Father and the Son. The West, on the other hand, with its more practical outlook, was concerned to show that the same Spirit who continues the work of Christ in the world is the personal medium whereby Christ in His Divine fullness is eternally present in the heart of the believer.

Harnack points out that the seventeenth century was marked by the beginning of Biblical criticism in the modern acceptation of the term. So far, however, from this having a damaging effect on the authenticity of Scripture, it seems to have achieved the opposite. The majority of the writers in our present period pay ungrudging tribute to the validity and the value of scriptural evidence, so much so that there is an increasing tendency on the part of defenders of opposing theories to appeal to it simultaneously as the deciding factor.

On account of this very circumstance, the spirit of the sacred writings comes to be better known, as well as the letter, so that the last state of controversialists is sometimes better than the first. 'The Bible that settles all differences often has a reflex light thrown upon it by the differences that it settles.'[1] Be that as it may, the appeal to Scripture figures far more prominently during these centuries than it ever did in the mediaeval age. It is upon the supreme authority of Scripture that the Reformed Church takes its stand when refuting Romanist teachings in the earlier century of the two, and its acceptance of the doctrines of the Trinity and of the Holy Spirit as generally set forth is declared to rest not on their splendid antiquity, but on their scriptural basis. Addressing a Jesuit antagonist in his *Religion of Protestants*,[2] Chillingworth observes, 'I am as verily and as strongly persuaded that I believe the Scripture, as you are that you believe the Church; and if I may be deceived, why may not you?' Apologetics seriously makes its appearance with Grotius and his contemporaries, but Arminian exponents of the time, in their suspicion of the idea of 'development,' adhere to Scripture exclusively, as also do the French Protestants. The literalism which thus threatens to become a heavy drag on sane progress in theological thought is kept within bounds by the beginnings of criticism mentioned above, but even more by the great constructive work of Biblical scholars of the calibre of Owen and Pearson, and the many Biblical histories, commentaries, harmonies, and paraphrases then issuing from the press, of which Henry Hammond's *Paraphrase and Annotations upon the New Testament* (1653) is a learned and celebrated example. Sermonic, institutional, and confessional styles of literature, which were noticeable toward the close of the mediaeval period, are now common, but with added point for the individual seeker after truth. The more formal treatises of the seventeenth century sometimes are heavy reading, and when Howe likes to amass his divisions and sub-divisions he knows how to be both intricate and tedious. The work of Cudworth, too, mingled as his English freely is with Greek and Latin, would necessarily make little popular appeal.

[1] Dr. W. B. Pope, Introduction to Winer's *Confessions of Christendom.*
[2] ii. 49.

But the common sense of the general reader would get its opportunity in the vigorous, and often anonymous, pamphleteering which was a feature of theological propaganda from the close of the seventeenth century, and which pressed the opinions of several of their authors without raising their reputations.

The comparative unprogressiveness of the Greek theology is just as pronounced in this period as it is in the mediaeval. This is so in the nature of the case, for the Greek Church does not accept any theory of 'development.' The content of the faith was finally given by the seventh Ecumenical Council, and all dogma must simply be its authentic explanation.[1] This is its standpoint, which Dr. Gavin describes as one of 'conservatism as a principle,' and which, so he would have us believe, by no means signifies stagnation. The principal Greek authority in the period is the *Orthodox Confession of the Eastern Church* (Ὀρθόδοξος ὁμολογία τῆς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἀνατολικῆς),[2] 1643, framed by Peter Mogilas († 1647), Metropolitan of Kieff, 'the father of Russian theology,' as against the Calvinizing efforts of the late Patriarch, Cyril Lucar († 1638). This Confession was confirmed by the Synod of Jerusalem, 1672, which also promulgated the *Eighteen Decrees* and the Confession of its president and convener, the Patriarch Dositheus. The Decrees have rather a Western flavour.

The *Formula of Concord* (1577) and the *Dort Decrees* (1619) are, as Harnack observes, both marks of transition to the modern period in the West. The former, compiled in the main by Chemnitz and Andreae, closed the synergistic controversy by a virtual triumph of Lutherans over Philippists. The latter were a censure of the Arminian Remonstrance on the part of moderate Calvinists of the 'infralapsarian' school, who, however, perhaps not a little significantly, failed to secure for their decrees the sanction of the Anglican representatives.

II

Formerly a pupil of Beza, Jacobus Arminius (1560–1609) broke away from Beza's Calvinism, as set forth in the Gallican

[1] See Gavin, *Greek Orthodox Thought*, pp. 4 ff.

[2] Schaff, ii. 275 ff.

and Belgic Confessions, in the very act of considering how he might refute the Calvinism of the less rigid type. The creed of the Remonstrants,[1] which was promulgated in 1610—after years of continental polemic which the Englishman, William Perkins († 1602), had taken a lion's share in arousing—laid down an election conditional on saving faith, itself conditional on the work of the Spirit. The importance attached by Arminian teachers to the preliminary influence of the Spirit in redemption leaves no excuse for Peter Sterry's reference to them as ' a sect of moralists, who give over the persuading power of the Spirit to strength of rhetoric and reason, inward or outward.' [2] The sting of such a comment will quickly be drawn by a perusal of the extensive writings of that brilliant pupil of Arminius, Simon Episcopius (1583–1643), the greatest theologian the Remonstrants possessed, in whose *Institutiones Theologicae*, for instance, the importance of Christian living ranks every whit as high as rectitude in belief. The influence of Episcopius is felt in the Confession of the Remonstrants (*Confessio seu Declaratio sententiae Pastorum, qui in foederato Belgio Remonstrantes vocantur*), which was drawn up in 1621. Hugo Grotius (1583–1645), his collaborator, says little directly concerning the doctrine of the Spirit in the course of his Commentaries or *Annotationes*, though it is noticeable that he is surer of the Spirit's Deity than is Episcopius. The same holds good in large measure in respect of his relation to later Arminian expositors, particularly a trio of professors at the Remonstrants' College in Amsterdam, Stephen Curcellaeus (1586–1659), Philip van Limborch (1633–1712), and Jean le Clerc, or Johannes Clericus (1657–1736), grand-nephew of Stephen, all of whom follow very closely the subordination theory of Episcopius.

During these years the chief seat of French Protestant theology was at Saumur, where in 1618 the Scottish divine, John Cameron (1579–1625), secured a professor's chair, and forthwith plunged into the predestination controversy against the Arminians. He and his followers, however, showed no bitterness in this, for all of them—Amyraut, Cappel, Daillé,

[1] *Remonstrantia, libellus supplex exhibitus Hollandiae et Westfrisiae Ordinibus*, 5 artt.

[2] *The Spirit's Conviction of Sin*, p. 28.

and the rest—may rightly be termed very moderate Calvinists, and their creed a kind of 'Calvinist Universalism.' Both Cameron and his distinguished pupil Moses Amyraut [Amyraldus] (1596–1664), whose views on this are available in his *Predestination* and his later work *Against the Arminian Error* (1646), saw in the intellect, rather than in the will, the objective of the Spirit's operations, the latter especially emphasizing the power of these operations in the hearts of the elect in ensuring that the deeper self follows the guidance of the enlightened mind. This objective was widened by a succeeding Saumur professor, Claude Pajon (1626–1685), to include environment and a measure of 'experience,' in a superficial sense; but Pajonism is more of a freak than a development as ordinarily understood, having little influence within France, and none without.

The doctrine of the Spirit received no considerable attention from contemporary Roman Catholicism, for Roman theology was either historical or traditional, and yielded in consequence no real freshness of thought. Moreover, doctrinal progress in Roman Catholic circles was checked by the prevalence of undoctrinal controversies. Still, there were at least two great Frenchmen who made contributions from opposite angles, while both proceeding against the Socinianism of the day, namely Petavius and Bossuet. Dionysius Petavius, or Denys Petau (1583–1652), sometime professor of theology in the University of Paris, is famed for producing the first great treatise of historical theology, the *De Theologicis Dogmatibus*, which he began to issue in 1644, but did not live to complete. It is anti-scholastic in standpoint, and allows for the principle of doctrinal development. The second volume entitled *De Trinitate*, the one that concerns this present study, is a ponderous historical effort. Jacques Bénigne Bossuet (1627–1704), Bishop of Meaux and champion of Gallicanism, was an able antagonist of all that depreciated Church authority, his *Exposition de la Doctrine de l'Église Catholique* (1671) being a strenuous defence of Catholic doctrines as against 'the Pretended Reformed Church.' In this he declares his belief in the Trinity and the principal operations of the Spirit as taught by the Roman Church, which include a special Divine influence in extreme unction and ordination.

III

English Protestantism in the turbulent days of the early seventeenth century is ushered in by a disputation between High Churchmen, such as Hooker and Andrewes, on the one hand, and Puritans, such as Thomas Cartwright and certain Cambridge fellow-extremists, on the other.[1] The points at issue primarily concern differing interpretations of the doctrine of the Church, and this, together with the ecclesiastical dogmatism displayed equally by both sides, invited small progress in any doctrine of the Spirit. Yet some progress is made, and particularly as the century advances. Hooker is, of course, noted for his authorship of the first great ecclesiastical work written in English, the *Ecclesiastical Polity* (1594–1597),[2] but in this the work of the Holy Spirit is not entirely overlooked. Lancelot Andrewes (1555–1626), who outlived Hooker twenty-six years and Cartwright twenty-three, was a learned and saintly prelate who left Hooker to reason with the Puritans, while he, with all his Anglo-Catholicism, fought the pretensions of Rome. This he does in his *Responsio* to Bellarmine, in which he asserts that the Holy Spirit, and not the Pope, is the present ' Vicar of Christ ' in the Church ; he does so also in his preaching, as perhaps befitted a friend of Grotius. At the same time, Andrewes was no preacher of polemics as generally understood, and his fifteen *Sermons on the Holy Spirit,* fourteen of which were preached before James I, reveal wonderful depth of spiritual insight. So also do the sermons of that great Dean of St. Paul's, John Donne (1573–1631). Other Anglican publications include the *Commentaries upon the Creed* by Thomas Jackson (1579–1640), Dean of Peterborough, an orthodox defence widely read at the time ; expositions of the doctrines of salvation from the pen of Hubert Thorndike (*c.* 1598–1672) ; that devotional treasure, *Holy Living* (1650), by Jeremy Taylor (1613–1667) ; and the *Religion of Protestants* (1637), by William Chillingworth (1602–1644), the ' Latitudinarian '—a fine debating effort in which

[1] Hallam dilates on Cartwright's extravagances in his *History of England*, i. 185 ff.

[2] ' The immediate occasion of the *Ecclesiastical Polity* seems to have been an attack of Travers [Hooker's colleague in the Temple pulpit] upon Hooker for extending salvation to Roman Catholics, and his lack of sympathy with Calvinism ' (Herzog, *Encycl.*). Also see Hallam, *Constitutional History of England* (1908 ed.), i. pp. 216 f.

the authority of the Bible is upheld as the supreme guide in spiritual things. The Calvinist *Irish Articles of Religion* (1615), while composed probably by Archbishop Ussher and afterwards adopted by the Irish Episcopal Church, has been described [1] as 'the connecting link between the Thirty-nine Articles and the Westminster Confession'; at all events it is generally regarded as the foundation of the latter. On the other side, then, the *Westminster Confession* (1647) appears as the expression of the views of Calvinistic Puritanism, and it remains to this day as the historic embodiment of Puritan traditions. One of the Puritan members of the Westminster Assembly was Peter Sterry († 1672), who is introduced here on account of a sermon on 'the Spirit's conviction of sin' (John xvi. 8), preached before the House of Commons 'upon the solemn day of their monthly fast,' November 26, 1645. It is a choicely worded discourse, characterized by spiritual directness, and containing many original thoughts. Finally, theological masters such as John Lightfoot (1602–1675) and Richard Baxter (1615–1691) were catholic enough to overstep the main denominational barrier in England, and were therefore claimed by men on both sides of it.

Later Scholasticism had set aside Plato for Aristotle, but the Platonic philosophy largely came to its own again in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Humanism. Now, much of the outlook of the Humanists was revived in the work of the Cambridge Platonists, a small circle of Christian philosophers, who blend with a love of the mystical that insistence on reason which was encouraged by Chillingworth and Baxter. They received their earliest stimulus, in a 'secular' sense, from Francis Bacon and Hobbes, and, in a religious sense, from the Arminians; also, in a measure, from the saner writings of Boehme.[2] It may thus be inferred that the attitude in which they discuss fundamentals in relation to God, life, and the universe is distinctly anti-scholastic; some superior persons called it 'latitudinarian.' There was, however, never the least doubt as to the intense spirituality of either their motive or, indeed, their method; and it was this consideration which

[1] Herzog, *Encycl.*

[2] Dean Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, p. 286 (5th ed.), gives Henry More's judgement of Boehme, which may be said to represent that of the Cambridge Platonists generally.

weighed so heavily with Archbishop Tillotson, on whom they exercised a definite influence. John Smith († 1652) and Henry More († 1687) are two typical examples which bear out this statement. They and their fellow-Platonists have their own doctrine of an ' inner light ' which is primarily attributed not to the Holy Spirit, as is that of Quakerism, but to ' sanctified reason.' But inasmuch as they preach a true salvation and sanctification by the Spirit, which they undoubtedly do, there is no need to labour the connexion between their ' inner light ' and the Divine Spirit, which is no less real because secondary to them. They find no difficulty in defending the doctrine of the Trinity, since Plato (with his trinity of mind or cause, word or reason, and soul of the universe) and Platonic teaching in the main were certainly suggestive of it ; especially that Neo-Platonism propounded by Erigena.[1] This was what Roger Bacon had been thinking four centuries before. So when Ralph Cudworth (1617–1688) refers to the subject in the preface to his *True Intellectual System of the Universe*, he asserts that, on that very account, there should be no prejudice in thoughtful minds against revealed religion.[2] Further he detects a clear indication of the Trinity in Persian theology, in which three hypostases in the same Deity were mentioned, ' whose distinctive characters are goodness, wisdom, and power.' [3] He finds the same in Greek religion (chap. iv), also in Egyptian religion—though not so significantly. In his *True Intellectual System* he asserts the existence of God as against the materialistic philosophy of Hobbes, the place of revelation as against Deism, and the reality of free-will as against the determinism of the time, thus upholding the general Christian position from the point of view of a Platonic philosopher. Cudworth may perhaps be regarded as the real leader of the Cambridge Platonists. At least, his writings form a comprehensive exposition of their views, and are enough in themselves to support Bishop Burnet's contention, quoted by Dean Inge, that this circle of Christian philosophers redeemed the Church of England from contempt.

[1] See my *Holy Spirit in the Mediaeval Church*, pp. 63 ff., 177.
[2] Also *Intell. System*, iv. 36 ; vol. ii. p. 387 (1845 ed.).
[3] *Ibid.*, iv. 16 (vol. i. pp. 482 f.).

IV

The first stage of the Trinitarian Controversy in England arose from Socinian [1] and Arminian publications on the doctrine of the Trinity, and these fell as seed into good ground on account of the spirit of controversy that was still abroad, and the existence of several sects which had sprung up during the Commonwealth. John Biddle (1615–1662), commonly known as the founder of English Unitarianism, who was imprisoned in 1645 for openly denying the personality of the Holy Spirit,[2] was, in company with his followers, largely in the mind of John Pearson (1612–1686), Bishop of Chester, when he wrote his *Exposition of the Creed* (1659), and particularly in that section of it, on Article viii, which treats of the Nature and Office of the Spirit.[3] Isaac Barrow (1630–1677), the great Cambridge scholar and Master of Trinity, turned from mathematics to theology in 1669 and contributed to contemporary discussions on the Trinity by *A Defence of the Blessed Trinity*, which was published posthumously. It is a book which does not deal exclusively with the Trinity, so that Trinitarian controversy does not narrow or embitter his view of the subject. A special paragraph is inserted in its later pages on the work of the Spirit which shows something of his power as a preacher. John Bunyan (1628–1688) does not enter here as one of the foremost debaters, though he may be allowed a place, and a very definite one, in this stage of the argument as a great writer on experimental theology and an orthodox defender of the Articles of faith. The other outstanding name in this connexion, besides that of Bishop Pearson, is that of John Owen (1616–1683), the Nonconformist Vice-Chancellor of Oxford, for whose Nonconformity he was attacked by both

1 Peter Sterry (*The Spirit's Conviction of Sin*, 28 f.) refers to contemporary Socinians in the following terms: 'The principles of reason are the pillars of religion and truth to these men. But reason is a pillar of a cloud; the Spirit only is the pillar of fire, which hath light in it. Reason is that *gladius versatilis*, that sword in the hand of the Cherubim that kept Paradise; a sword that turns every way. It may keep men from the Tree of Life, but can never bring them to it.'

2 Priestley (*Corruptions of Christianity*, i. 142) considered this charge unfounded, declaring that Biddle believed in the personality of the Holy Spirit, but considered Him 'a being of a super-angelic order.'

3 Some of Pearson's interpretations are somewhat far-fetched, as when he sees in 2 Cor. iii. 15–17 an indication that the Lord to whom Moses spake unveiled (Ex. xxxiv. 34) was the Holy Spirit, and in Isa. xlviii. 16 the revelation that the Holy Spirit is not under the feet of Christ.

Sherlock and Stillingfleet, though they never greatly perturbed him. Owen wrote three books against the Arminians, nor did he altogether forget them in his *Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity* (1669). His more famous work *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, which he wrote in the years 1677 and 1678,[1] was directed, so he says in the preface, against the Socinians, especially the first part concerning the personality and divine Nature of the Spirit. It is a thorough, painstaking work upon a scriptural basis, with a sustained appeal to common sense, and a sound knowledge of the human mind. That it was needed when published there can be no question. ' There is,' remarks Owen, ' in the days wherein we live, an anti-spirit, set up and advanced against the Spirit of God, in His Being and all His operations,' expressing itself in selfishness and error.[2] Many also deny His Deity and Personality, and while it is necessary to oppose such, those who undertake the task are not thereby edified.[3] It was, however, a duty to be fulfilled, though it is unlikely that Owen was right in ascribing unbelief in the Trinity to the Quakers also.[4] Evidently he overstressed their characteristic hesitation to be very dogmatic on such points of theology.

Unfortunately for the peace of the Church, those who defended the doctrine of the Trinity began to fall out among themselves. William Clagett (dates uncertain), Gray's Inn preacher and king's chaplain, issued *A Discourse concerning the Operations of the Holy Spirit*, which ran into the second edition by 1680, in which he sets out to show that the clergy of the Church of England were not departing from the accepted teaching with regard to the graces and operations of the Spirit. This proved to be a criticism, in none too good a spirit, of Dr. Owen's recent publication, the second part of it, being issued separately, renewing the attack on Owen, and referring to defences of him which appeared after the issue of the first part. It is not always impressive, even as a criticism, and is interesting principally as emphasizing the salutary effect of Owen's great work. William Beveridge (1637–1708), Bishop of St. Asaph for four years before his death, makes a contribu-

[1] A more probable date than 1674, sometimes given.
[2] *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, p. 26.
[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 28 f.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 63.

tion to current debate in his *Thesaurus Theologicus*, though he was no lover of argument ; and it was left to George Bull (1634–1710), the learned Bishop of St. David's, who had written in 1670 the *Harmonia Apostolica* on the subject of justification, to conclude the first phase of the discussion by his masterpiece, the *Defensio Fidei Nicenae* (1685), which is an able onslaught upon the Unitarian position.[1] But a rift had begun in the Trinitarian side which was shortly to widen. Clagett's attack on Owen had merely referred to questions of the work of the Holy Spirit, but the Being of the Spirit was to be brought up for contention in the sudden development associated with the name of Sherlock, when there arose a division between 'real' and 'nominal' Trinitarians which was a source of considerable amusement to the Unitarian party, and which proved even beyond the power of Stillingfleet to heal.

V

Freedom of conscience was granted by James II to his English subjects in the Declaration of Indulgence (1687), and, in the liberty of doctrine and worship which followed the Act of Toleration two years later, further opportunities were presented for frank expression of opinion.[2] Rogers, Howe's biographer, observes that Lord Herbert of Cherbury was the only prominent English writer down to the middle of the seventeenth century who had publicly proceeded against Christianity. Now he was succeeded by Hobbes and his associates, and the sceptical reasoning which was thus thoroughly aroused began to spread. It was against such a background that the second stage of the Trinitarian Controversy was initiated by Dean Sherlock, and carried on principally by Anglican divines, illustrating abundantly a statement of Rogers that the Trinity is 'a subject on which it is one of the highest achievements of a merely mortal mind not to fail, and to fail disgracefully.'

William Sherlock (*c.* 1641–1707), Dean of St. Paul's, wrote

1 'The term "Unitarian" first emerges in 1682' (*Encycl. Brit.*), possibly in connexion with their overtures to the Mahommedans with a view to their conversion to Unitarianism. Cf. Horsley, *Tracts*, pp. 308, 588.

2 See John Howe, *On the Carnality of Religious Contention* (1693).

and published in 1690 his sensational treatise, *A Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation*, directed against 'Unitarians or Socinians, and containing an answer to both,' the main argument being that the Divine Unity is composed of the mutual self-consciousness of three Minds. This is referred to by him in the preface as 'a very easy and intelligible notion of a Trinity in unity,' and 'the true Scripture account of it, and agreeable to the doctrine of the ancient Fathers.' An *Apology* for his *Vindication* appeared three years later, and was also (as he states in its introduction) written against Dr. John Wallis and the Socinians under his leadership. In this he defends such terms as 'person' and 'essence' because they 'will not suffer heretics to lie concealed under Scripture-phrases.' Moreover, he reminds his readers that Trinitarian theology had to meet not only the onslaughts of Unitarianism, but also the 'new philosophy' as taught by Hobbes, whose rationalist and mathematical ideas definitely militated against orthodox opinions after the publication of his *Leviathan*. 'This,' says Sherlock, 'was Mr. Hobbes' reason why we should not pretend to know anything of God, nor inquire after His attributes, because He has but one attribute, which is, that He is incomprehensible.'[1] But all Sherlock's scathing remarks at the expense of the philosophers and the Unitarians did not save him from the result of taking theological risks, taken, though these had been, from the best of motives; and Robert South (1633–1716) launched his famous attack on his views on the Trinity in his book, *Animadversions upon Dr. Sherlock's Book, entitled a Vindication of the Holy and Ever-Blessed Trinity* (1693), 'owing, it is said, to a personal grudge.'[2] This can well be believed, for though South writes anonymously, as 'a Divine of the Church of England,' he was naturally both fiery and sarcastic, and a free use of sarcasm was useful internal evidence of his authorship! Thus his book is a satire 'humbly offered to his [Sherlock's] admirers, and to himself the chief of them.' It followed closely on Sherlock's *Apology*, in which, as South declares, he withdraws his opposition to the old terms 'substance,' and the like,

[1] Introduction to the *Apology*. South sneers at contemporary philosophy while Stillingfleet particularly singles out Locke.

[2] *Encycl. Brit.*, art. 'South.'

which he previously expressed in his *Vindication*. South's argument is a denial that self-consciousness necessarily means personality, and, at the same time, an assertion that Sherlock, in reasoning on the basis of this assumption, is upholding sheer tritheism, advocating 'three Gods.' Hence he does not hesitate in his preface to refer to such a 'false defence' of the Trinity as 'a silly, heretical notion, solely of his own invention.' The following year Sherlock published anonymously an answer to South's *Animadversions* entitled *A Defence of Dr. Sherlock's Notion of a Trinity in Unity*, which largely covers old ground. In this he shows slightly more respect for the old terminology, but is careful to add that there are limitations to any terminology, new or old, which has reference to the Trinity. South rejoined in his *Tritheism charged upon Dr. Sherlock's New Notion of the Trinity, and the charge made good*, which served only to add fuel to the fire.

Meanwhile the Unitarians had not been idle, and both Sherlock and South had been subjected to criticism by their leader, John Wallis (1616–1703), a great mathematician and Fellow of the Royal Society. Most of his works are on branches of mathematics, and he was not the first to treat the doctrine of the Trinity more as a mathematician than as a theologian. From 1690 onwards he published several pamphlets of Unitarian propaganda, one which will receive further notice being *The Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity*, which was issued anonymously [1] early in 1693. It is undoubtedly clever, but constantly begs the question. Fortunately for the Trinitarian side, there were writers of conspicuous ability who were better able to deal with these Unitarian attacks on account of their not being heavily involved in the argument between Sherlock and South. Probably the most outstanding of these was the great writer and preacher John Howe (1630–1705), sometime Cromwell's domestic chaplain, whom Sherlock evidently

1 The number of writers in this controversy who did their work anonymously is considerable, and their reasons for this may not be far to seek! It was an age in which many thought rudeness often essential to candour. On the other hand, John Howe wrote certain anonymous letters on the Trinity to Wallis in 1691, in which there is no trace of acrimony. Indeed his authorship was generally betrayed by evidence quite opposite to that which betrayed South's!—for example, his beautiful letter to Lady Russell on her husband's execution in 1683, though unsigned, was at once acknowledged by her.

regarded as the representative of Nonconformist opinion.[1] Intimate with Stillingfleet, he was even more temperate in debate than he. 'There is hardly a sentiment in the many volumes which he has left behind him, which one would wish to blot out. . . . To him victory was nothing, truth everything.' So avers his biographer. Accordingly his *Calm and Sober Inquiry*, which he undertook after reading Cudworth, Wallis, Sherlock, and South, is true to its title, being reverent, moderate, and full of quiet reasoning; showing the possibility of a Trinity in the Godhead, and the impossibility of denying it, though on the ground of reason alone. Howe was obliged later to publish two pamphlets in defence of his book, which simply repeat the arguments therein used.

All this time the controversy between Sherlock and South had been extending, and the Unitarians, as has already been observed, were beginning to make much capital out of the differences displayed. Hence there appeared a few efforts at solving both problems simultaneously. An anonymous publication was brought out in 1696 entitled *The Distinction between Real and Nominal Trinitarians Examined, and the Doctrine of a Real Trinity vindicated from the Charge of Tritheism.* This was written in answer to a Unitarian or Socinian pamphlet on the controversy being waged between the two Trinitarian parties, and, while it does not formally criticize South's party, it favours Sherlock's method of attacking the common enemy. Its main position, as revealed in the first chapter, is that the Divine Persons may at least be called without heresy 'three Minds' and 'three Spirits,' even though such a course be judged inadvisable. It proceeds, in the second chapter, to declare that what Sherlock did was merely to attempt to explain a real Trinity in face of Sabellian tendencies in the Church; and if he is now concerned to vindicate himself from the charge of tritheism, South is just as much concerned to vindicate himself from the charge of Sabellianism. An eirenicon under the name of *A Discourse in Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity* was issued anonymously in 1697 by Edward Stillingfleet (1635–1699), Bishop of Worcester, who had already, in 1661, published his *Irenicum* as a means of healing the wounds in the Body of Christ—a book which was

[1] Cf. Rogers, *Life of Howe*, p. 151.

not to be without great influence on Wesley. Though Stillingfleet was no Latitudinarian, his moderate outlook is clearly appreciated in this volume, by which he tried to still the strife between Sherlock and South and their respective followers while striking a blow at Unitarianism.[1] The *Vindication* also contains a defence of the Trinity as against Locke, as also do certain of his letters of later date. In spite of Stillingfleet's efforts, however, the disputation between the two Trinitarian parties continued, and so increased in bitterness that the king intervened to bring it to an abrupt conclusion.

On the other hand, the argument with the Unitarians was being carried on with increasing intensity. The work of Howe was supplemented by two Trinitarians who, like himself, were not among the principals in the wrangle begun by Sherlock. Erasmus Warren (dates uncertain), Rector of Worlington in Suffolk, published in 1709 *An Essay towards showing the Reasonableness of the Doctrine of the Holy and Undivided Trinity*, written in the form of a letter to his son, which seeks to establish the proposition 'that in the one Substance of the Godhead there are three Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, equal in power and eternity.' The other is the son of one of the two thousand ministers expelled by the Act of Uniformity, namely, Matthew Henry (1662–1714). His greatest work, *The Exposition of the Old and New Testaments*, of which that part on the New Testament alone is used here, was begun in 1704 and completed to the end of Acts in 1710, being finished after his death by others from fragments of his expositions. The commentary is devotional rather than critical or apologetic, a fact which in itself may be sufficient to indicate a breathing space in the contention.

VI

The Unitarian Controversy in England, which is sometimes referred to as the Arian Controversy, arose out of the Trinitarian Controversy, as even a cursory reading of Stillingfleet's preface to his *Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity* proves beyond question. The responsibility for this new discussion

[1] One outbreak of bigotry on his part brought him momentarily into collision with Howe, who, as Stillingfleet said, discoursed with him 'gravely and piously, more like a gentleman than a divine.' (See Rogers, *Life of Howe*, p. 117.)

rests upon Samuel Clarke (1675–1729), who brought out in 1712 his *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, in which he denied not only the orthodox setting of the doctrine, but also that the Early Church ever believed it. Though he dealt gently, almost apologetically, with the situation, and readily smoothed over the indignation of his ecclesiastical superiors, the fact that one of his theological and philosophical standing could adopt so surprising an attitude produced an immediate commotion in the world of thought. The dissemination of Clarke's views was undertaken by his biographer, William Whiston (1667–1752), Anglican clergyman and, for a time, professor of mathematics at Cambridge, until he was expelled for Unitarian opinions. Like Clarke, he was under the impression, especially after a study of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, that Arianism was the primitive form of Christian belief, and it was on the basis of this previous study that his chief work, *Primitive Christianity Revived* (1712), came to be written. This line of attack at once explains why Trinitarians such as Edwards and Waterland devoted their energies so largely to examining the statements of the Fathers. But Whiston's influence was perhaps more startling than impressive. Other 'modern Arians' associated with Clarke were Daniel Whitby (1638–1726), a learned Anglican divine who, in 1714, openly denied the propriety of appealing to antiquity on the subject of the Trinity (as Whiston had done!), and in his *Last Thoughts*, published posthumously in 1727, denied the Trinity altogether; and John Jackson (1686–1763), who probably possessed polemical qualities to a yet greater degree.

Among the writers against the Unitarian side may be classed Jean le Clerc, already mentioned in connexion with the Arminian movement. He, however, frankly admits that argument often does more harm than good, and in his *Abstract and Judgment of Dr. Clarke's Polemical or Controversial Writings* (1713) he chides the Unitarians very gently. Moreover, the Arminian idea of subordination within the Divine Triunity, which he puts forward in the *Abstract* as a possible ground of agreement, might certainly have done more harm than good to the Trinitarian cause had it carried much weight in England. It was in this country that the main assault on the Unitarian position was delivered. In 1712 John Edwards (1637–1716),

a noted Calvinistic divine, issued *Some Animadversions on Dr. Clarke's Scripture Doctrine (as he stiles it) of the Trinity*, 'briefly showing that his quotations out of the Fathers are forced, his texts produced from Scripture are wrested, his arguments and inferences are weak and illogical, his whole performance falls short of his design.' This was followed in 1714 by *Remarks upon Dr. Clarke's Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, published anonymously by Francis Gastrell (1662–1725), Bishop of Chester. In the same year Robert Nelson (1656–1715), pupil and biographer of Bishop Bull, sent forth a pamphlet against Clarke, which was answered on Clarke's behalf by a divine styling himself 'Country Clergyman,'[1] while a pamphlet by Edward Wells (1665–1727) received a somewhat personal rejoinder from Clarke himself.[2] But the most effective answer to Clarke was delivered by Daniel Waterland (1683–1740), Master of Magdalene and Chaplain to George I, who issued three *Vindications of Christ's Divinity* between 1719 and 1724. These are masterpieces of careful scholarship and clever argument, founded on Scripture and the Fathers, which, though dealing primarily with the Divinity of Christ, touch constantly on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, as on the Trinity generally. The first *Vindication* ran through three editions in twelve months, which is sufficient evidence of its popularity, and also of its need. Its principal objective was the above-mentioned 'Clergyman in the Country,' who had dishonourably published private correspondence that had been taking place between them. In effect, however, it was directed also against Clarke, though Waterland observes that Clarke was at least a fair opponent. All three *Vindications* are framed on the basis of Queries, each Query of Waterland's being followed by the reply of his antagonist, which, in turn, is answered by the author. Waterland's references to the

[1] John Jackson is a very possible claimant to the identity of the 'Country Clergyman.' In the preface to his *Farther Vindication* Waterland suspects him of writing the *Reply* to his *First Defence*, while in the preface to his *Second Vindication* he refers to Whiston as the 'Country Clergyman's' friend. Waterland waxes scornful at the Unitarians' expense on account of the constant anonymity of their writings, 'pelting us from their coverts with misreports, and slandering in masquerade' (*A Farther Vindication*, p. 133). It may be noted that anti-trinitarian opinions obtained a hold in 'Dissent,' particularly in English Presbyterianism, from 1718 onwards. (See Dr. Simon's *Revival of Religion in England in the Eighteenth Century*, pp. 120 ff.)

[2] *A Letter to the Reverend Dr. Wells . . . in Answer to His Remarks.*

testimony of the Fathers are found mainly in the twenty-fifth to the twenty-eighth Queries of the *Vindication* and throughout the *Second Vindication*. The preface to the latter is a reply to the 'Country Clergyman's' statement that the Ante-Nicene Fathers did not believe in the orthodox view of the Trinity, and one of the conclusions of the argument in the book itself is that they unquestionably taught the full Deity of the Spirit (p. 168). He will not have it for a moment that primitive Christianity was essentially Arian, and that the generally accepted dogmas were fashioned in the Middle Ages. The Schoolmen, he bluntly says, are certainly not responsible for the orthodox position. This has been the Catholic belief as developed from the earliest Christian thought. On the other hand, Dr. Clarke 'shows his reader tritheism, and he shows him Sabellianism (keeping the Catholic doctrine, which is neither, out of sight), and then recommends Arianism (disguised) to him, as the best of the three.'[1] The *Second Vindication* (1723), which was written 'in answer to the Country Clergyman's reply,' is a particularly thorough work. The *Farther Vindication* (1724) appeared 'in answer to a pamphlet entitled *Observations on Dr. Waterland's Second Defence*,' which, he believed, was written either by Clarke or Jackson. This is much the shortest work of the three. An unimportant, though voluminous, writer in support of the labours of Waterland was Simon Browne († 1732), an Independent minister, who published *A Disquisition on the Trinity*. This, however, did not command any considerable attention.

VII

The Toleration Act of 1689 had afforded no relief to persons who denied the doctrine of the Trinity, but the disabilities of such were lessened in 1779, and again in 1813; so that, during these years, English Unitarianism solidified into a denomination, markedly so during the settled pastorate of Theophilus Lindsey († 1808) at a London Unitarian church from 1774 to 1793. In the interval between the first stage of the Unitarian Controversy in England and the second, now to be noticed, there is little direct allusion to the points

[1] *A Vindication of Christ's Divinity*, p. 304.

at issue. Certain of the writings of Isaac Watts (1674–1748), the well-known Nonconformist hymn-writer, were suspected of a Unitarian flavour, as, for example, his *Doctrine of the Trinity* (1722). But, while of the opinion that belief in the doctrine is not absolutely necessary to salvation, he did not deny the truth of the doctrine itself. This is more than suggested by his great hymn, 'When I survey the wondrous Cross,' as also by another of his on the Trinity, beginning, 'We give immortal praise,' and ending with the significant couplet :

> Where reason fails, with all her powers,
> There faith prevails, and love adores.

Priestley thought that Watts really believed in a kind of subordination in the Trinity, but he frankly acknowledged that this was a guess, and that there were no grounds for definitely ascribing to him a Unitarian creed.[1]

The picture of the revived controversy is filled by two Fellows of the Royal Society, who fought a duel before a considerable audience of the reading public. The Nonconformity of the day, in which Unitarianism had secured at least a comfortable foothold, cradled that noted scientist and theologian, Joseph Priestley (1733–1804). In 1761 he had proclaimed his rejection of the Trinity in his *Scripture Doctrine of Remission*, but in 1782 his principal theological work appeared, entitled, *A History of the Corruptions of Christianity*, in which the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity figures as one decided 'corruption,' or 'innovation.' In the course of this work, which he dedicated to his friend Theophilus Lindsey, he quotes from the Fathers, who still commanded attention, also from Faustus Socinus [2] and Samuel Clarke—as would be expected—besides alluding approvingly to Whiston. The line taken by Priestley was to uphold the Godhead and Divine Personality of the Father only, appearing to regard any ascription of these to the Son as involving their ascription to the Holy Spirit. 'The simple

1 *Corruptions*, i. p. 149.

2 Old Socinianism, however, put upon Christ 'honour such as no mere mortal could bear and live' (Dr. W. B. Pope, Introduction to Winer's *Confessions of Christendom*), which cannot be readily attributed to the theological rationalism of the later eighteenth century

humanity of Christ,' he observes, 'seems now to be the prevailing opinion among those who have distinguished themselves by their freedom of thinking in matters of religion.'[1] As to the English Trinitarians, they are characterized as either tritheists or Socinians,[2] Waterland being an illustration of the former, and Bishops Pearson and Bull illustrations of the latter![3]

Samuel Horsley (1733–1806), Bishop of St. Asaph, undertook to reply, and did so, while he was Archdeacon of St. Albans, in his *Tracts in Controversy with Dr. Priestley* (1783–1786). Like his opponent, Horsley was eminent in the scientific world as well as in the theological, and so was perhaps all the more eager to show that scientific prestige should not exempt theological inaccuracies from the judgement which they deserve. This intention of his is clearly indicated by the editor in his preface to the 1812 edition of the *Tracts*, and cannot be lost sight of when reading the *Tracts* themselves, where Horsley shows that 'in most of his assertions Dr. Priestley is confuted by his own authorities.' The *Letters* (1784) are the most important part of the *Tracts*, and were written in reply to Priestley's *Letters* which had been issued in answer to Horsley's *Charge to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of St. Albans*, delivered with Priestley's *Corruptions* especially in view. In these, Horsley speaks in similar fashion. 'Dr. Priestley,' he says, 'great as his attainments are confessed to be in the profane sciences, is altogether unqualified to throw any light upon a question of ecclesiastical antiquity.' Priestley replied later in the same year (1784) with a second series of *Letters*, which, in turn, were answered by Horsley partly in a *Sermon on the Incarnation* (1785) but mainly in his *Remarks on Dr. Priestley's Second Letters* (1786). Priestley returned to the charge in a third series of *Letters*, and was met again by Horsley in the course of his *Supplemental Disquisitions*. Gibbon agreed with the general opinion that Horsley had the better of the argument. How far this influenced Priestley in his ultimate resolve to emigrate to America, which he carried out in 1794, it is not safe to determine. But it is undeniable that the Unitarian party deemed it wise to remain in the background so long as Horsley was alive; and when it took advantage of his death to reassert

[1] *Corruptions*, i. p. 141. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 147. [3] *Ibid.*, pp. 147 f.

itself, no surer counter-stroke could be devised than the reprinting of the *Tracts*.

Appended Note

During the eighteenth century Unitarianism appeared in America as a legacy of Arminian 'Subordinationism,' and the controversy which developed was carried on by Jonathan Mayhew († 1766), James Freeman († 1835), and others on the Unitarian side, who were finally answered by Moses Stuart († 1852), the Waterland of American theology.

In Ireland the Trinitarian controversy arose with the famous Emlyn case in 1703, and a consequent drift towards Unitarianism called forth from Jonathan Swift (1667–1745), Dean of St. Patrick's in Dublin, a sermon in defence of the Trinity which has been commended as 'one of the best tracts which Dean Swift ever wrote' (J. Wesley, Sermon *On the Trinity*, 1775, and Jonathan Crowther, *History of the Wesleyan Methodists*, 1815). This sermon came in for severe criticism at the hands of Robert Clayton, the Unitarian Bishop of Clogher, in his *Defence of the Essay on Spirit*, 1753. According to Clayton, the Old Testament admittedly shows the Spirit to be a distinct, intelligent Agent, but probably this refers to Gabriel! The Father is essentially superior to the Son, and delegates His power to the Son and the Spirit, who are His creations. Christian Trinitarianism has sprung from Platonism, and the Pope, not Scripture, is responsible for it (*Essay on Spirit*, 1751). Eph. iv. 4–6 shows that the Father only is God, and 1 Cor. xii. 4–6 affords similar testimony. Scripture and reason, untrammelled by doctrinal history, leave us with Unitarian belief (*Sequel to the Essay on Spirit*, 1752). So far from the Athanasian doctrine of the Trinity being above reason, it is contrary to it. 'Athanasianism is nothing else but Sabellianism disguised' (*Defence of the Essay on Spirit*). This statement of Clayton's is peculiar if only on account of Priestley's assertion (*Corruptions*, i. pp. 74 f.) that Sabellianism is nothing else than Unitarianism disguised! Priestley, at any rate, had grounds for *his* affirmation. Job Orton (1717–1783), for example, a distinguished Independent

minister, was a Sabellian and, at the same time, an enthusiastic admirer of Priestley and Lindsey.

VIII

From the standpoint of the majority of the Schoolmen, philosophy and theology were both indispensable to a full presentation of Christian belief. Metaphysics apart from theism was regarded as so much empty speculation, and theism apart from metaphysics as not doing justice to intellectual inquiry. But the separation of philosophy from theology, begun by Duns Scotus and continued by Nominalists and Humanists, confronted the seventeenth-century divines as a *fait accompli* for which, according to Daniel Hoffmann († 1611), no apology whatever was required. Keckermann († 1609), while expressing doubt as to whether such separation ought ever to have occurred, was careful to emphasize the distinctness of the contributions made by philosophy and theology, on the ground that revealed truth must always be something peculiar to itself.[1] But while these two sciences still maintained some show of mutual indebtedness at the beginning of the seventeenth century, they came to view each other with open antagonism in the course of the next two hundred years. Spinoza in his *Tractatus* says outright that philosophy and theology cannot be related because their aims are totally divergent. So philosophy made little attempt in this age to shed light on the relation of Christian revelation to ultimate reality, and was in that measure untrue to Francis Bacon's idea of it as an essentially practical system. 'Anciently deeply religious, almost in every age the expression of a religious sentiment,' it was 'led away by false fundamental principles.'[2]

1. Deism in England, where it chiefly flourished, was encouraged partly by the Latitudinarian school in the English

[1] 'For fifteen centuries of its existence the Christian Church was supposed to be under the immediate guidance of the Holy Spirit, which miraculously controlled its decisions, and precluded the possibility of error. This theory broke down at the Reformation, but it left behind it a confused sense that theological truth was in some way different from other truth.'—J. A. Froude, *A Plea for the Free Discussion of Theological Difficulties* (1863).

[2] See W. B. Pope, *Compendium of Christian Theology*, i. p. 13; also Horsley *A Charge to the Clergy*.

Church, but much more by Unitarianism; and even if this influence of Unitarianism was unconscious—for Samuel Clarke himself opposed the Deists in his *Discourse concerning the Being and Attributes of God* (1705)—its reality was unhesitatingly pointed out by Stillingfleet in the preface to his *Discourse in Vindication of the Trinity* (pp. 48 ff.). Again, the revival of philosophy under Descartes abroad, and Hobbes and Locke at home, afforded an encouragement of its own to the labours of Lord Herbert and the Deists in his train:[1] and, though Descartes built his own system on a theistic foundation, it was from the succeeding philosophy, with its anti-Christian bias, that Deism drew so much of its inspiration. In consequence, therefore, Deism speedily proved itself to be, in practice, a destructive philosophy, setting forth for an unfallen humanity a species of natural religion which had no room in its ethical teaching for any doctrines of salvation and the Spirit, and accordingly denying both Divine immanence and Divine revelation. John Toland († 1722) in his *Christianity not Mysterious* (1696) is seen to insist on reason as the one standard of measurement for all belief, thereby discrediting the 'unintelligible' and emptying the Christian faith of all its 'mysterious' content. Matthew Tindal († 1733) in his *Christianity as old as the Creation* (1730) upholds a revised or 'expurgated' form of Christianity as essentially 'natural religion,' asserting, in other words, that revelation is not required, but that morality is the one thing needful. Thomas Morgan († 1743) declares in his *Moral Philosopher* (1737) that no doctrine is true unless it be both moral and reasonable —in accordance with the standards of a rationalistic mind. Such an attitude as these writers illustrate tolerated no doctrine of a Holy Spirit, but rather consigned it at once to the limbo of the 'miraculous' for which no reasonable person could have any use. Deism, in fact, merely serves to show how far apostles of reason could run into inconsistencies, with their strange combination of belief in God and belief in naturalism, with their admission on the one hand that God can reveal Himself and their denial on the other that He actually does.

1 'Deism was an application to theology, never intended by Bacon, of the new philosophy of induction and experience, as also an application of the sensational philosophy never intended by Locke.'—Pope, *ibid.*, i. p. 147.

Like Scholastic Mysticism in the Middle Ages, it carried within itself the forces of its own disintegration.

The opponents of the Deists met them on their own ground, and when so engaged they had little opportunity or occasion to mention the doctrine particularly before us. Prominent among these were Stillingfleet and Waterland, who have appeared against the Unitarians; William Law, who, in his *Case of Reason* (1732), launched an attack from a somewhat different angle; and Charles Leslie († 1722), the author of *A Short and Easy Method with the Deists* (1697), in which the doctrines of Christianity are shown to be founded on indisputable fact. It was with Tindal immediately in view that the renowned Joseph Butler (1692–1752), Bishop of Durham, wrote his *Analogy of Religion* (1736). In the 'Advertisement' he remarks that many people seemed to think that nothing remained but to set up Christianity 'as a principal subject of mirth and ridicule, as it were by way of reprisals, for its having so long interrupted the pleasures of the world.' He includes in his scope the whole mass of Deistic speculation, arguing from the difficulties, the reasonableness, and the Divine authorship of the natural order to those of the supernatural, showing that objections to revelation are also objections to natural religion, and asserting the existence and the necessity of revelation. The work, of which parts one and two deal with natural and revealed religion respectively, was, in Dr. Pope's language, 'the argument of analogy triumphantly applied.' To Butler, natural theology and Christian revelation must closely co-operate in order to sustain the edifice of a complete philosophy. 'Christianity,' he declares, 'is not only an external institution of natural religion, and a new promulgation of God's general providence as righteous Governor and Judge of the world, but it contains also a revelation of a particular dispensation of Providence, carrying on by His Son and Spirit for the recovery and salvation of mankind, who are represented in Scripture to be in a state of ruin. And in consequence of this revelation being made, we are commanded to be baptized, not only "in the name of the Father" but also "of the Son," and "of the Holy Ghost": and other obligations of duty, unknown before, to the Son and the Holy Ghost are revealed. . . . God is the Governor of the world, upon the

evidence of reason ; Christ is the Mediator between God and man, and the Holy Ghost our Guide and Sanctifier, upon the evidence of revelation.' [1]

English Deism was the source of continental Deism, the most famous exponent of which was Voltaire († 1778), one of Locke's admirers. Often superficial and inconsistent, he attacked atheism and Christianity alike, though he inveighed against the intolerance and superstition of the Church rather than its Founder. While emphasizing reality in religion, he found no place for personal relationship with the Divine. To one whose God was only an intellectual necessity, a doctrine of the Spirit could mean nothing.

2. A close connexion exists between natural theology and moral philosophy, at least in the sense in which, in different spheres, they are alternatives to revealed truth. Within the scope of what may broadly be referred to as continental philosophy, further alternatives are presented by the inevitable variations due to proceeding from purely subjective principles. We should therefore expect to find here some definite doctrines of God, if not many allusions to a distinctive doctrine of a Holy Spirit. The revolt against the Scholastic method in the philosophic world began in earnest with Descartes († 1650), the originator of psychological idealism, whose second basic principle, *cogito ergo sum* ['I think, therefore I am'] was the only fact to him utterly beyond doubt ; yet he did his work with a firm belief in the need for Divine guidance in the development of his philosophy of 'substances.' Influenced at first by Descartes, to whom he owed much, Spinoza († 1677) [2] evolved a pantheism which cut right across the system of his predecessor, all so-called 'substances' being, in his opinion, the attributes of the one true Substance, of Divine Reality, which Itself is 'impersonal' in the sense that It does not exist personally apart from the

1 *Analogy*, ii. 1.

Though never actually a Deist, Conyers Middleton (1683–1750) supported the Deistic philosophy by his writings against the credibility of miracles and the literal inspiration of Scripture, on account of which he was taken to task by Waterland. He published a small work in addition, entitled *An Essay on the Gift of Tongues*.

2 Cf. Dr. Caird's statement that 'in the Spinozistic philosophy there are few differences from Descartes which cannot be traced to the necessary development of Cartesian principles.'

universe. This attitude is seen in his *Ethics*.[1] His main attack upon Scriptural authority is found in his *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, a rationalistic production of his earlier days when he professed theism, and mainly a defence of liberty of thought. To Leibnitz († 1716), who in turn owed much to Spinoza—without, as Froude says, altogether understanding him,—God is the centre of a great harmony, in which there is a parallelism of mind and matter but no interaction or interconnexion. He regards the Trinity as an ineffable mystery, but, so far from denying the doctrine, he defends it in his *Defensio Trinitatis* (1669), in which he argues that God is altogether beyond the reach of human understanding unless He eternally begets and reveals Himself. Christian Wolff († 1754) worked on the foundation of Leibnitz. With a touch suggestive of Butler, he propounds that whatever can be proved to belong to natural theology is contained also in revelation, but he declares that revealed truth is not all acceptable as judged by the standards of natural theology. When he attempts to make all theological 'mysteries' intellectually, indeed mathematically, comprehensible, he is clearly attempting the impossible; and even the small part which he assigns to revelation by the side of reason is further reduced in the teaching of his disciples. No wonder he stirred against himself the Pietists of Halle! In bringing naturalism and revelation to mean the same thing, Lessing († 1781) is even less helpful, and in taking the stand that philosophy is a more reliable teacher than theology he offers little guidance to the searcher for truth, though he was certainly a genuine searcher himself. Like Wolff, Kant († 1804) began his labours under the influence of Leibnitz, giving, as he did, a central place to God in his system, though it is not evident how his reasoning could have led him to this. He is very definite, as against Hume, that every effect must have a cause, and, by insisting on duty, instead of happiness, as a rational principle, he imparted to moral philosophy some impetus in a 'spiritual'

1 The second part of Howe's *Living Temple* appeared after the publication of the *Ethics*, and went far to answer it. Howe lays himself out to unmask what he considers to be the real anti-religious motives of Spinoza. He was perhaps overpainting the picture, yet certainly Spinoza's reasonings concerning the Divine Existence are not at all convincing. 'We have a right,' says Froude, 'to object at once to an argument in which the conclusion is more obvious than the premises' (*Essay on Spinoza*, 1855).

direction.[1] In 1799 one of Kant's followers, J. G. Fichte († 1814), issued a booklet *On the Grounds of our Belief in a Divine Government of the Universe*, in which he describes God as 'the living moral order,' plus reason and will, but without 'personality.' This brought him into collision with the authorities; and it is indeed difficult to perceive how he could emphasize, as he did, the essential unity of man with such a God, especially as he retains human personality in its completeness. Later he saw the difficulty himself, and in his *Way to a Blessed Life* he refers to God as the source and ground of all egos, and generally gives the term a fuller and a warmer content. In his *Vocation of Man* (1800) he asserts the Divine creation of man, and the divinity of human purpose. Heralded by Jacobi and others, Schleiermacher introduced into philosophic thought a new emphasis on the individual relation of the soul to God, putting new life into German theology after so much rationalistic influence.[2] But this is beyond the limit of the present study.

3. The British school of philosophy developed an attitude which was by no means free from either scepticism or materialism, and which led several English theologians to refer to it warningly as 'the new philosophy.' The first protest from this quarter against the scholastic method that we find in these centuries under review was made by Francis Bacon (1561–1626), Viscount St. Albans and Lord Chancellor of England. Though not altogether happy in some of his illustrations, he takes strong exception to building exclusively on the ancient foundations of knowledge; for reason is essential to right thinking, and the doctrines of faith may quite possibly clash with the findings of reason. It is on this ground that he distinguishes so clearly between reason and faith and their respective operations. Guided by Bacon, without, however, being a disciple of his, Hobbes († 1679) made a similar distinction, and in so similar a manner as that Erdmann is of the opinion that they close, rather than open, a particular period in the history of philosophy. But Hobbes certainly bears

1 W. B. Pope (*Compendium*, iii. p. 164) speaks of Kant's definition of Ethics, viz. 'the science of the laws of freedom,' as 'profoundly Christian.' 'But,' he adds, 'it omits what is essential to the new and supreme system, that the laws of freedom are under the government of the Holy Spirit.'

2 See James Orr, *The Progress of Dogma*, p. 313.

a relationship to the years in which he lived. The Restoration period was particularly philosophic and scientific, and prompted accordingly an increasing desire for some basis of speculation by the side of, or beyond, the Bible. Confidence in the powers of the human intellect was renewed, the founding of the Royal Society being a sign of the times. Unfortunately the new attitude encouraged a widespread indifference to dogmatic religion, and a consequent decline in the general standards of morality. For this Hobbes must be held partly responsible. His egoism and materialism as set forth in the *Leviathan* were intended as incentives to rational conduct, but utilitarianism is not a very uplifting force at best, and moralists joined with the theologians in saying so. Hobbes made bold to say that there was nothing in his *Leviathan* contrary to the Nicene Creed—a strange statement for a confirmed Deist ! Though Locke († 1704) was critical of the religion of the day, he was particularly critical of Deism. A close acquaintance of Limborch, Le Clerc, and of certain of the Cambridge Platonists, he believed in the Being and help of the Holy Spirit—as is seen in his *Essay concerning Human Understanding* (1690), which is distinctly experimental, and still more in his *Reasonableness of Christianity* (1695). This latter work was written in view of the Sherlock controversy on the one hand and the Deistic controversy on the other, and is an attempt to solve both problems by 'restoring' the Christian faith to the simplicity of the New Testament statements. This, however, revealed his reluctance to believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, for which he was rebuked by Stillingfleet in his *Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity* (p. 34).[1] Bishop Berkeley († 1753) in his *Minute Philosopher* (1732) aimed a severe blow at the prevailing rationalism. He met the philosophy which asserted the impossibility of knowing the Ultimate Cause, with the declaration that the universe and its causes exist only as they

1 The philosophy of Locke exercised considerable influence also in America, where it early attracted Jonathan Edwards (1703–1758), who grew to be the giant of American philosophic circles of the period ; and, through him, it gave some assistance in shaping the 'New-England' theology. Edwards deviates from Locke as regards the freedom of the will, supporting the Calvinist theory as against the more Arminian theory held by Locke. He deviates also in the arguments which he presents on behalf of the doctrine of the Trinity, which may be found in his *Essay on the Trinity*—a book too orthodox for the majority of his followers !

The wave of anti-trinitarian opinion which swept through America in the eighteenth century originated very largely from Unitarianism in England.

are mentally and spiritually conceived, such conception, too, being possible only through the Divine Spirit Himself. To Berkeley the source of ideas in the mind is the Holy Spirit, and in holding this view he shows an affinity to Jonathan Edwards and, in a measure, to Locke. David Hume († 1776), in spite of his admiration for Butler and his close study of Berkeley, was content to construct his philosophy of life on the basis of moral utilitarianism. His sceptical outlook led him to regard mind much as Berkeley regarded matter. In considering only ideas themselves, he overlooks the self behind the ideas. His world is a world of phenomena, his experience of which induces him to argue—not very consistently—against the credibility of the miraculous. His attack upon the generally accepted doctrine of cause and effect, which was met, as observed already, by Kant, results in an utter denial of Divine causation, while his denial of personal identity in man means a denial of personal identity in God. A notable reply to Hume was delivered by Thomas Reid in his *Inquiry into the Human Mind* (1764), and another by George Campbell (1719–1796), who had come under Reid's influence at Aberdeen, in his *Dissertation on Miracles* (1763), which had special reference to Hume's treatise on the same subject. Campbell's last work was his *New Translation of the Four Gospels* (1778), the first volume of the 1789 edition being composed of preliminary dissertations and the second taking the form of a commentary.[1] Paley's *Evidences* (1794) was a contribution to the defence of miracles against the rationalist offensive, without, however, being a direct contribution to the doctrine of the Spirit.

Christian philosophers such as Cudworth set themselves to bring the philosophy of the age within the scope of religion, as also did theologians such as Howe and Wesley, though from another standpoint. Not that they ceded one inch of the ground of Christian truth in so doing. Rather did they stress the spiritual source of all ' saving ' knowledge, declaring that, while religion affects the consciousness, it does not originate from it, or it could never affect the conscience. For all whose

1 Campbell also directed some attention to Methodism, as will be seen from his sermon on 2 Tim. i. 7, entitled ' The Spirit of the Gospel neither a Spirit of Superstition nor of Enthusiasm,' which he preached before the Aberdeen Synod on April 9, 1771.

task it was to lead men aright, there was, indeed, an imperative necessity to appraise systems of thought at their practical value by relating them to life. In this connexion, Samuel Horsley formed a judgement of his own which he did not hesitate to sustain, and in his *Charge to the Clergy* he laid down that the duty of Christian ministers was to maintain the theology of the Christian revelation in its native purity, 'undebased and undiminished by the refinements of philosophy.'

IX

Goethe once observed that 'Christianity ought not to number any Mystics among its followers, for the religion itself offers us mysteries enough.' Doubtless Christianity has 'mysteries enough' for the worldly or the rationalistic mind, but not for the mind which spiritually discerns aspects of eternal truth which the Holy Spirit on that very account is able to reveal.[1] Even so, the first part of this characteristic remark of Goethe's is not thereby resolved into a *non sequitur*, and the existence of 'Mystics' necessitated. Yet the history of doctrine strongly suggests that there is a legitimate place for 'true' Mysticism, namely the Mysticism of an essentially positive nature whose high and practical expressions, from Eckhart to Bengel, made increasing contribution not only to personal piety but also to doctrinal development. This type of Mysticism, now a recoil from theological controversy, now a revolt against religious externalism, may be perceived clearly in different European countries and in both Romanism and Protestantism in the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

In the nature of the case, Mysticism always has its peculiar dangers. At its best it denotes some overemphasis of the mystical elements of religion; and this is never far removed from an 'enthusiasm' in which feeling is exalted to the level of faith, and revelation (in a corporate or objective sense) is underestimated, if not entirely overlooked. Thus, in its impure forms, Mysticism rests on an individualistic foundation which it is all the time undermining by belittling personality.

[1] See Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, p. 61 (5th ed.), for Chrysostom's definition of 'mystery.'

The risk of isolation, so far as such a process may leave any consciousness of it, may willingly be run if only the goal be attained, and God become all in all. But this very belittlement of human personality inevitably carries with itself a belittlement of the Divine Personality, on account of which the 'all in all' of God to the soul must be something else, and therefore something less, than that described in the New Testament. In the words of Prof. Pringle-Pattison, 'God ceases to be an object and becomes an experience.'[1] With impure forms, however, we have here very little to do, and all the following movements, with the possible exception of Quietism, have made real contributions to the thought of the Church.

1. Jansenism, originating with Cornelius Jansen († 1638), Bishop of Ypres, always remained strictly Roman Catholic. Principally a French movement, it seriously declined in the early part of the eighteenth century, and was driven into Holland. This was at any rate partly due to its mystical extremisms which, as in certain other movements, began to appear later. But Jansenism, such as that at Port Royal, was of a distinctly evangelical type, in spite of the influence of Descartes on both Pascal and Arnauld. Anti-scholastic in its outlook, as may be imagined, it emphasized the inward and the real in religion. Essentially a spiritual revival, it stressed the 'mystical' and the experimental as against the rational in the consideration of right thinking and living. Jansen's *Augustinus*, as also much of his other work, was directed to show Protestants 'that Catholics could interpret the Bible in a manner quite as mystical and pietistic as theirs.'[2] This, however, was but one direction of a movement which 'was an inner regeneration of the Church through repentance and faith, religious awakening and asceticism, as these were understood by Augustine.'[3] The conversion of Pascal († 1662), the mathematician and famous writer, took place under Jansenist influence and was of a somewhat ecstatic nature. The mystical element in Pascal's faith was always decidedly strong. In his renowned *Letters* exposing the beliefs and

1 *Encycl. Brit.*, art. 'Mysticism.'
2 Viscount St. Cyres in *Encycl. Brit.*, art. 'Jansen.'
3 Harnack, *History of Dogma* (E. tr.), vii. § 2.

methods of the Jesuits, he supported and defended Antoine Arnauld (†1694), the Jansenist leader, in his Jansenist interpretations of Augustine.[1]

2. Another mystical movement in Roman Catholicism during the seventeenth century was Quietism. In Tholuck's opinion, 'what Jansenism was in France, and Pietism in Germany, and Quakerism in England, Quietism was in Spain.'[2] Quietism, like Jansenism, emphasized the possibility of a direct communication between the Divine Spirit and the 'saints'; accordingly, like Jansenism, it earned the hostility of the Jesuits. It should, however, be remembered that while Jansenism strove to revive and to reform the Church, Quietism, except in its elementary stages, was a revolt against the Church, as far as concerned its assistance in the spiritual life, and, in a measure, also a protest against certain Christian dogmas as taught by the Church. Heralded by such Mystics as St. Teresa and St. Juan of the Cross,[3] Spanish Quietism fully appears with Miguel de Molinos († 1697), in whose well-known ascetical treatise, *The Spiritual Guide* (*Guida Spirituale*), published in 1675, advice for holy living is given which loudly decried the methods of Romanism. Religious 'internalism' is set forth with such exaggeration as that individual consciousness is something to be overcome, and contemplation is the method to be employed in overcoming it. It is true that Molinos was condemned for extremisms for which he was not altogether responsible, yet, in so far as he could assert that it was not necessary for God to have revealed Himself even in Jesus, his teaching was regarded by the Church as highly dangerous to Christianity itself.

Quietism in France was represented by Madame Guyon († 1717), an extravagant woman who had come under the influence of Molinos, and with whom she kept up a long correspondence. An extremist in asceticism, while of irreproach-

[1] The author of a well-known devotional booklet (ed. H. R. Allenson), *The Practice of the Presence of God*, containing the conversations and letters of Brother Lawrence (Nicholas Herman of Lorraine, † 1691), a Parisian monk, may well have been influenced by the Jansenist movement at Port Royal; as witness its 'mystical' or pietistic strain of devotion—inward and individual, and, at the same time, closely linked to the Church. For Lawrence, Guyon, and others, see an excellent little book by Evelyn Underhill, *The Mystics of the Church*, and the chapter on French seventeenth-century Mysticism.

[2] Herzog, *Encycl.*, art. 'Molinos.'

[3] See Inge, *Christian Mysticism* (5th ed.), pp. 218 ff.

able character, she advocated the necessity of merging the soul with the Spirit of God, and the human mind with the Divine, in such 'mystical' fashion as that her teaching was openly condemned by the Roman Church. Pierre Poiret († 1719), a Mystic of French Reformed persuasion, edited her works. But Quietism, like Jansenism, did not go far. Bossuet, the great French Roman Catholic theologian and prelate, proved too formidable an antagonist for Molinos and Guyon ; and when a fine Christian of the calibre of Fénelon († 1715) succumbed to the latter's influence and ventured to defend her, Bossuet's party gained the ascendancy over him also, though mainly by reason of his voluntary submission to the judgement of the Pope. Fénelon, however, as Viscount St. Cyres observes, was not regarded by his French contemporaries as properly a Quietist, for the extravagances of Madame Guyon's ideas never made any appeal to him.

3. In England the movement in the direction of a deeper and simpler spiritual life, and away from the tense atmosphere of the Trinitarian Controversy, was originated in 1647 by George Fox († 1691). Fox commented thus on his own preaching: 'I was to direct people to the Spirit that gave forth the Scriptures, by which they might be led into all truth, and so up to Christ and God, as those had been who gave them forth.'[1] Certainly the rapid spread of the Quaker teaching showed the need of a more spiritual presentation of religion than the English Church then afforded, and a similar necessity characterized contemporary religious life in America—as is evident from the work of William Penn († 1718). The outstanding theologian of the Society of Friends is Robert Barclay (1648–1690), the eminent Scotsman and fast friend of both Fox and Penn, whose *Catechism* and *Confession of Faith* (1673) came to be regarded officially as embodying the Quaker tenets. His *Apology for the True Christian Divinity* (1676), an elaboration of fifteen propositions or *theses theologiæ* which is his greatest work, contains the fullest statement of Quaker theology. What is generally referred to as the distinctive feature of this is the doctrine of the 'inner light'—the belief that an immediate influence of the Holy Spirit is vouchsafed to each true child of God—which, taken closely with the

[1] Dr. Thomas Chase, in Herzog's *Encycl.*

Scriptures as the necessary corrective, constitutes Quakerism a form of 'true' Mysticism. In this connexion it should be clearly understood that there is no radical difference between the Friends and the ordinary Churches of Christendom as touching the fundamental Christian doctrines, though, as Mr. Brayshaw states,[1] 'they have always shrunk from rigid Trinitarian definitions.'[2]

4. Emanuel Swedenborg (1688–1772), philosopher and scientist, and a man of remarkable personality and ability, claimed to have witnessed the Lord's Second Coming, and to be the human though the unwilling instrument in founding the New Church. He declared that the 'Old' Church had been divinely brought to an end, and that he was the precursor of the New Jerusalem dispensation, whose beginning he placed in the year 1757. The New Church is therefore regarded by its members not as a sect or branch of the existing Universal Church, but as the Church of this new dispensation, raised up to reveal truths which are meant for the new age, and which are to simplify the 'complicated' dogmas which the followers of Christ have been taught in time past. Eager to follow the truth as it appeared to him, particularly by means of visions and conversations with spirits which he professed to have enjoyed,[3] he revived a kind of Sabellianism in his pronouncements on the Trinity which are certainly not lacking in interest.

The essence of Swedenborgianism is not evangelical in the sense commonly understood, for the description given to the New Church is 'the religion of the regenerated soul,' and its mission is 'to teach spiritual truths rationally.'[4] There is

[1] *Encycl. Brit.*

[2] William Penn was imprisoned in the Tower for an attack on the doctrine of the Trinity, among others, in his *Sandy Foundation Shaken* (1668). His *Primitive Christianity* (1696) was an attempt to 'simplify' Christian belief on the Quaker model.

[3] That John Wesley owed nothing to the 'Mysticism' of the type of Swedenborg's is clear from a very frank criticism which appears in his *Journal* under the date February 28, 1770: 'I sat down to read and seriously consider some of the writings of Baron Swedenborg. I began with huge prejudice in his favour, knowing him to be a pious man, one of a strong understanding, of much learning, and one who thoroughly believed himself. But I could not hold out long. Any one of his visions puts his real character out of doubt. He is one of the most ingenious, lively, entertaining madmen, that ever set pen to paper.' In Wesley's mind, the 'wildness' of Swedenborg's 'waking dreams' is principally due to the fact that they are 'far remote both from Scripture and common-sense.'

[4] H. G. Drummond, *New Church Manual*, p. 6.

no doctrine of forgiveness such as that proclaimed by the Reformed Churches. We are saved when we pray to be kept from doing wrong and try to do right, the Saviourhood of Christ being His help which is granted in answer to such prayer.[1]

5. Pietism in Germany, within the Lutheran Church especially, was a counter-stroke to Deistic teaching which had crossed over from England by way of France, and still more to the prevalence of rationalistic philosophy for which Spinoza and other German scholars were responsible. The intellectualism and formalism of the Lutheran Church itself also gave considerable encouragement to the rise of Pietism, in that the correctness of theological opinions seemed to receive more attention than the practice of Christian principles. In the words of Kübel, 'Pietism was indifferent where orthodoxy was passionate, and passionate where orthodoxy was indifferent.'[2] So does the swing of the pendulum mean the substitution of one form of extremism for another. But, while some of the Pietists, in regard for their practical aims, ceased to give due consideration to the value of philosophic and 'objective' reasoning, others, such as Spener († 1705), the real originator of the movement, allotted a more influential position to Scripture than did many other 'mystical' writers in these two centuries.

One who did much to prepare for the appearance of Pietism in Germany was Jakob Boehme (1575–1624), under whose influence Spener afterwards began his work. Boehme himself was influenced by Schwenkfeld, the Protestant Mystic,[3] and he could also include in his spiritual ancestry the German anti-scholastic Mystics of the fourteenth century. His genius clearly opens a new chapter in the development of mystical ideas,[4] and although his was a freshness largely overlain by crude combinations of scriptural and natural theology, his spiritual depth is undoubted. From the issue of the *Aurora*, his first work, he was constantly censured by the ecclesiastical

1 H. G. Drummond, *New Church Manual*, p. 21.

2 Herzog's *Encycl.*, art. 'Rationalism.'

3 See my *Holy Spirit in the Mediaeval Church*, p. 250.

4 'For us he is most interesting as marking the transition from the purely subjective type of Mysticism to Symbolism, or rather as the author of a brilliant attempt to fuse the two into one system.'—Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, p. 278.

authorities.[1] Another forerunner of Pietism was Heinrich Müller († 1675), a Lutheran theologian and Biblical scholar of some note, and the author of several devotional works. Johann Musäus († 1681) was a theologian of the same type, whose views on the doctrine of justification by faith closely resemble those afterwards held by Spener.

Spener's pupil, Francke († 1727), and Joachim Lange († 1744), Francke's associate at Halle, the centre of Pietism, were both students and expositors of the Bible; but far more famous than either as a Biblical exegete was Johann Albrecht Bengel (1687–1752), who may be considered one of the later Pietist school, and whose *Gnomon Novi Testamenti* (1742) John Wesley so highly esteemed. Apart from certain references to the doctrine of the Trinity, the *Gnomon* pays no noticeable attention to the doctrine of the Spirit.

In the midst of the rationalistic atmosphere still prevailing in Germany, it was the influence of Pietism through Zinzendorf († 1760), pupil of Francke and admirer of Spener, which largely accounted for the formation of the Moravian Church from the descendants of the Hussites to whom Wyclif had preached; and if this reveals some link between Wesley and Wyclif through the Moravians, it also reveals a tendency to 'enthusiasm' in Moravianism which matured later on and alienated Wesley altogether.[2] Spangenberg († 1792), at first associated with the Halle Pietists, afterward Zinzendorf's successor as Bishop of the Moravian Church, was less of a 'Mystic' than

[1] Boehme had several disciples outside of his own country; some in England, notably John Pordage († 1698) and, in later life, William Law (1686–1761). Pordage was the founder of the Philadelphian Society, a Behmenist sect. Much of his teaching is as fantastic as is some of Boehme's, and includes his four categories of the Spirit's revelations, which, however, are not of importance. In William Law's famous work, *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life* (1728), which owes nothing directly to Boehme—as its early influence on John and Charles Wesley perhaps indicates—there is little specific reference to the Holy Spirit; but the whole of its impressive appeal for real and inward religion is actually based on the operations of the Holy Spirit in the individual life, without which its production would have been inconceivable. This also appears in other references of his to the Spirit of God as the originator of all that is good in human character.

[2] E.g.—the Quietist or Antinomian ideas of certain Moravians in London were an offence to Wesley's practical mind (see *New History of Methodism*, vol. i. p. 284), but they managed in some measure to creep into the early Methodist Societies. In the *Minutes of the Conference* of 1744 the following occurs:

> '*Question:* Have we not also leaned towards Antinomianism?
> *Answer:* We are afraid we have.
> *Q.* What is Antinomianism?
> *A.* The doctrine which makes void the law through faith.'

Zinzendorf, and it was as the moderate, sane theologian of his Church that he once searched Wesley's soul on the subject of the Witness of the Spirit.

Mysticism is an unusual experience in the history of religion. As we have observed, it is the overstressing of certain subjective elements of a non-rational or supra-rational nature when faced with close realization of the Infinite.[1] Butler in his *Analogy* (ii. 7) had even felt compelled to refer to ' a mixture of real enthusiasm and real knavery often found in the same characters.' Mysticism should therefore not loom too large in doctrinal development, for this, taken in its proper perspective, keeps non-rational processes well within bounds. Yet those rationalizing processes by which the mysterious, or the supernatural, is arbitrarily forced out of religion, point to a far more unattractive extreme.

X

When writing his *Analogy* Butler bewailed the irreligious atmosphere of the nation and the powerlessness of the English Church. ' It was too late for him to try to support a falling Church,' he said when he declined the primacy. The educated classes still cajoled with infidelity in spite of the blows which Butler and others were inflicting on the Deists, while the mass of the people were utterly indifferent. ' We see on every side,' observes Wesley, ' either men of no religion at all, or men of a lifeless, formal religion.' [2] The Evangelical Revival met this crying need as a revival of practical religion towards God and man—the Johannine theology in modern expression—based on the certainty of a living spiritual experience. There was no new departure in doctrine itself. What appeared new was but a re-emphasis of scriptural truths which had remained embedded, and forgotten, in the belief of the Church. The defence of the historic position of the Catholic Church in the course of the Trinitarian and Unitarian controversies was as a buttress to Wesley's theology, for all his insistence on

1 So Rudolf Otto, *The Idea of the Holy*, p. 22. ' While sharing the nature of religion, [Mysticism] shows a preponderance of its non-rational elements and an overstressing of them in respect to the " overabounding " aspect of the " numen " ' (p. 88 *n.*).

2 *An Earnest Appeal*, § 2. Also see *A New History of Methodism* (art. by Dr. Townsend), i. 77 ff., and Dr. J. S. Simon, *The Revival of Religion in England in the Eighteenth Century*, 44 ff.

the work of the Spirit was on His work as the Spirit *of God* distinctly. In the section of the first part of his *Farther Appeal* in which he replies to some criticisms of the Bishop of Lichfield, he endeavours to show that the various promises and declarations in the Scriptures concerning the work of the Spirit are for all believers in all ages. Never, however, does Wesley countenance the 'enthusiastic': 'Beware of that daughter of pride, enthusiasm. O keep at the utmost distance from it! Give no place to a heated imagination.'[1] And if much of his phrasing is mystical—as, for example, his statement (in Sermon cxxxviii) that we receive the Holy Spirit 'that we may, by degrees, be accustomed to receive and carry God within us'—it is no more 'mystical' than that of St. Paul. Contemporary philosophy was not without its influence on Methodism, as Dr. Workman indicates,[2] nor without its contrasts to it. 'Certainly never was a more consummate coxcomb!' remarks Wesley of Voltaire,[3] while in a reference to him in company with Rousseau and Hume he asserts that 'whoever teach to seek happiness without the Spirit are monsters and the pests of society.'[4] 'The Evangelical Revival,' Professor Tout of Manchester once observed, 'is only one aspect of a widespread reaction against the intellectualism of the fifty years after 1688.' On the other hand, it was only at first that Wesley came under the influence of the Mystics.[5] He edited the principal works of William Law and Madame Guyon, but even before his 'change of heart' he became antagonistic to 'quietism' in all its forms, styling the Mystics 'one great antichrist.' Early in 1738 he wrote of them as those 'whose noble descriptions of union with God and internal religion made everything else appear mean, flat, and insipid. But in truth they make good works appear so too. . . . All the other enemies of Christianity are triflers; the Mystics are the most dangerous: they stab it in the vitals, and its most serious professors are most likely to fall by

1 Quoted by W. B. Pope, *Compendium*, iii. 94.

2 In *A New History of Methodism*, i. 16 ff.

3 *Journal*, August 26, 1785.

4 *Sermon* cxix, containing evidently his considered judgement, being written in 1789.

5 The 'Holy Club' at Oxford is at least reminiscent of Spener's *collegia pietatis*. For the relation of Methodism to Mysticism see *A New History of Methodism* (H. B. Workman's art.), i. 53 ff.

them.'[1] Entries in the *Journal*[2] refer to Mysticism as a poison, and a passage in the *Earnest Appeal*[3] describes certain Mystic divines as those 'that utterly decry the use of reason.'

Wesley smote English Deism from the experimental angle by his doctrine of the Spirit and the undeniable evidence of the complete change in the lives of those who fully accepted it. In 1749 he prophesied 'that, in a century or two, the people of England will be fairly divided into real Deists and real Christians,' and he viewed the prospect as 'rather an advantage to the Christian cause.' The test of reality is always insistent and always effective, and Wesley employed it from the beginning to the end. 'To make the universal Christianity witnessed to by the Established Church real, and the real Christianity of the Nonconformists universal, this may be said to have been the original mission of Methodism.'[4] And at this task the Methodists were not left to labour alone. Philip Doddridge († 1751) made his contribution from the side of Dissent in such publications as his *Lectures on Pneumatology* (1763), and Joseph Milner († 1797), the Church historian, from the side of the Establishment in his *Sermons* and his *Essays on the Influence of the Holy Spirit* (1789). Associated with Milner in the evangelical school of the Church of England were his brother Isaac, William Romaine, Henry and John Venn, John Newton, Charles Simeon, together with certain laymen such as William Cowper, the poet, and the great William Wilberforce. Methodist theology continued to find outstanding systematizers and exponents in Richard Watson († 1833) and Adam Clarke († 1832), besides others in the years immediately following, who, however, do not come within the scope of this study.

The doctrine of the Holy Spirit is essentially 'practical'; it is this first and foremost. But, in regard to any subject, what is secondary is by no means negligible, but second only to what is primary; so, in this connexion, emphasis on the work of the Spirit cannot properly obscure questions of its

[1] Quoted by James H. Rigg in *The Churchmanship of John Wesley*, pp. 25 f., from Southey's *Life of Wesley*.

[2] August 28, 1763; December 15, 1788. [3] § 30.

[4] Dr. J. Scott Lidgett in *A New History of Methodism*, II. 438. Actually the mission of Methodism accomplished more even than this. 'The Methodists themselves were the least result of the Methodist revival.'—John Richard Green, *History of the English People*, p. 720.

Origin and modes of operation. Bishop Gore is right in stating that we cannot afford to neglect the responsibilities of thought for the opportunities of action; and the more we set ourselves to explore the realm of thought in relation to this doctrine, the more is the impression made upon us that one of the needs of the present age is a real theology of the Spirit which may be applied with a new force to a new world. Modern psychological research, in its promising efforts to reconcile science and religion finally,[1] has opened up the way for restatements of this doctrine which hitherto have been impossible. But restatement does not exclude reiteration, and, in the important period now under review, we are not only tracing the development of the doctrine of the Spirit in times preparatory to our own; we are reminding ourselves of aspects of truth which are as vital now as ever.

[1] See Dr. Hadfield's art. in *The Spirit* (1919), edited by B. H. Streeter, p. 115.

II

THE GODHEAD OF THE SPIRIT

ὁ δὲ Κύριος τὸ Πνεῦμά ἐστιν

II

THE GODHEAD OF THE SPIRIT

I

THERE is a statement by Professor R. C. Moberly on record to the effect that if the Holy Ghost is God, He is absolutely and identically God—*singularis, unicus, et totus Deus*; and this was the considered judgement of the Mediaeval Church from Isidore to Bellarmine. The more closely scriptural evidence was examined, the more convinced were the overwhelming majority of theologians of the full Deity of the Spirit; and so much so that they declared that, in the Trinity, any two Persons are not together greater than a Third, for the whole Godhead resides in Each, and All act in the acts of Each. There is little reason for supposing that Arminius adopted any other attitude, for he refers to the Holy Spirit as 'infinite, eternal, boundless (*immensus*), and of the same Godhead together with God the Father and the Son.'[1] This was the view of the Greek Church, which held strongly that the Holy Spirit is equal in every respect to the Father and the Son, differing from Them only in reference to source.[2] Episcopius was mainly responsible for a deviation from this position in his 'subordination theory,' which coloured the whole outlook of succeeding Arminian writers. 'It is certain,' he says, 'that, in Scripture, Deity, or Divine perfections, are ascribed to these three Persons. Indeed, it is clear that the name of God itself is given to the Father and the Son. That this is so in regard to the Father no one doubts. In regard to the Son there is also a clear case, since He is called God not only by implication (John i. 1), but also expressly (Heb. i. 8 f.). In regard to the Holy Spirit the position is not so clear. For nowhere in Scripture, that I am aware of, is the Holy Spirit

[1] *Thesis vi, de Sp. sanct.*, 3.

[2] *Orthodox Conf.*, *Q. lxx.* The Greeks felt that the Deity of the Spirit would be more safely upheld as against the *Eastern* heretics by their belief in His procession from the Father only, than by the Western belief in the *Filioque*. (See Orr, *Progress of Dogma*, 130 f.)

called God outright or in so many terms, but always either the Spirit of God, or the Spirit of the Son or of Christ.' Here he mentions certain doubts on the subject entertained by some of the Fathers. 'At any rate,' he resumes, 'it is certain that Erasmus tells us the same, that never is the Holy Spirit openly called God, though the Father is called God frequently, and the Son occasionally.[1] It is certain, too, that Hilary, nowhere in the twelve books on the Trinity which he wrote, says that the Holy Spirit should be worshipped, or assigns to Him the name of God.'[2] Scripture references to the Trinity are then reviewed, and their force acknowledged. 'From these,' he writes, 'I conclude that it should not appear extraordinary if one and the same Divine Nature be assigned to these three Persons, since Scripture so manifestly attributes to Them those Divine perfections which are proper to the Divine Nature. However, I add . . . that it is certain from the same Scriptures that Deity and Divine perfections are ascribed to these three Persons not correspondingly (*collateraliter*) or co-ordinately, but subordinately; in this way, that the Father alone has from Himself, or from no other, that Divine Nature and those Divine perfections, but the Son and the Holy Spirit have them from the Father; and therefore the Father is the source and first principle (*fons ac principium*) of all the Deity which is in the Son and the Holy Spirit.'[3] This was going beyond what was generally understood as implied by the familiar term *principium*, which concerned relations of source within the Godhead without affecting the Divine Nature or Essence of the Persons. But Episcopius is convinced of a real subordination in the Deity, though 'it appears that the position of subordination, which characterizes the Holy Spirit in regard to the Son, is not equally clear and certain from Scripture as is the position of subordination which characterizes the Holy Spirit in regard to the Father.'[4] It is evidently

[1] Yet Erasmus, in his *Exposition of the Common Creed*, emphasizes at length the Godhead of the Spirit.

[2] See Dr. Swete's comment on Hilary in his *Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*, p. 304: 'It seems to him more reverent to be silent where Scripture is silent. Hence his scheme of the Trinity is incomplete; the third Person is not wholly co-ordinated with the first and the second.'

[3] *Institutiones Theologicae*, lib. iv. sect. ii. § 32. Cp. *ibid.*, xxxiii. 25—'Unde consequitur, Patrem sic esse primum ut etiam summus sit, tum ordine, tum dignitate, tum potestate.'

[4] *Ibid.*, iv. ii. 36.

an exclusive attention to the letter of Scripture which forbids Episcopius to pay any serious heed to doctrinal development as understood in the West.[1] It is true that *The Confession of the Remonstrants*, which was drawn up by him, contains nothing that could be construed into subordination, and stresses rather the eternal Deity of the Spirit. But this was a public document representing the views of most of the Arminians of the day, and, in any case, it was written some years before the *Institutiones*.

The *Annotationes* of Grotius shows that, while its author was by no means chained to Western expositions as a whole, he cannot be said to follow the example of Episcopius, for, throughout this work of his, the full Deity of the Spirit is very definitely acknowledged. On the other hand, the influence of Episcopius on Remonstrant theology is clearly reflected in the works of Curcellaeus. 'Wherever Scripture touches upon the subject of God,' he writes, 'these Three, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, are joined and mentioned together . . . and from those passages it is evident that the Son and the Holy Spirit are sharers (*consortes*) along with the Father of the Divine Nature. . . . Yet the Holy Spirit is nowhere expressly called God, but only by inference (*per consequentiam*).' Curcellaeus is sure that such an inference is right, for he proceeds to quote from Scripture pointing out the omnipresence, omniscience, omnipotence, and creatorship of the Spirit. At the same time, he is equally sure of a subordination of the Holy Spirit to the Father, shown by the fact that the simple name of 'God' is usually in Scripture understood to designate the Father. Scripture also extends this subordination of the Holy Spirit to the Son as well as to the Father, and he further quotes by way of illustration.[2] 'They err who declare that the Son and the Holy Spirit are equal in every respect to the Father.'[3] He continues: 'That prerogative (*praerogativa*) which the sacred writings everywhere attribute to the Father in the Godhead, over the Son and the Holy Spirit, does not allow us to assert that the one whole Divine Nature resides in

[1] This is also suggested by his strong sympathy with the Greek doctrine of the Procession.

[2] *Institutio Religionis Christianae*, ii. 19; also see his *Prima Dissertatio Theologica de Vocibus Trinitatis*, § 60.

[3] *Dissertatio*, § 37.

the Father as that similarly the whole resides in the Son, and the whole also in the Holy Spirit.' [1] Curcellaeus manifestly reads more into the term ' prerogative ' than ever was understood by the great mediaeval theologians, who, though they taught a definite order in the triune Life of the Deity, insisted that the whole Godhead resides in the Son and in the Holy Spirit even as in the Father. Accordingly we find this writer eagerly quoted by the Unitarians in later days, and, on the other hand, severely taken to task by Stillingfleet.[2] Philip van Limborch and Jean le Clerc did not so easily lend themselves to Unitarian quotation. Limborch says precisely the same as Curcellaeus concerning the Deity of the Spirit being a logical inference. He refers to such passages as Acts v. 3, 5, arguing that, though the name of God is not expressly given to the Holy Spirit in Scripture, Divine attributes are ascribed to Him.[3] ' We conclude,' he continues, ' that the Divine Essence is common both to the Son and the Holy Spirit. But also it is no less certain that among these three Persons there is a sort of subordination ; since the Father has Divine Nature from Himself, the Son and the Holy Spirit have it from the Father, who is thus the source and first principle (*fons et principium*) of the Godhead in the Son and the Holy Spirit. . . . There is also a certain super-eminence of the Father in respect of the Son, and of the Father and the Son in respect of the Holy Spirit by reason of dignity and power, inasmuch as it is more eminent (*dignius*) to beget than to be begotten, to breathe forth than to be breathed forth.' [4] Moreover, the Spirit is subordinate to the Son in that the Son sends Him from the Father.[5] Le Clerc followed in the same strain, advocating ' subordination ' as a help to understanding the unity of the tri-personal life of God, which was the very thing that mediaeval churchmen had flatly denied. To them any such subordination as affected the Divine Essence in actual practice was clearly detrimental to the Divine unity, and what they would have said to the Arminians was said by the Saumur School of Moderate Calvinism. Moses Amyraut unhesitatingly declares that ' the whole of the Divine Essence

[1] *Dissertatio*, § 60.
[2] *A Discourse in Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, pp. 76 ff.
[3] *Theologia Christiana*, ii. 17, §§ 23, 24.
[4] *Ibid.*, § 25.
[5] *Ibid.*, § 26.

resides in each Person'—in emphatic contradiction to the position of Curcellaeus especially; while in his references to certain well-known Trinitarian analogies, he argues that the equality of the third part to the others, as, for instance, that of *voluntas* [will] to *intelligentia* [understanding], at least strongly suggests the absence of any notion of inferiority such as the Arminians attached to the Spirit of God.[1] On this point Rome expressed agreement with Saumur. Petavius, after mentioning the opinions on this subject held by various 'misguided' writers, reminds his readers of the repeated decisions of early Catholic Councils which leave no doubt as to the increasing conviction of the Church. The lengthy title to the fourteenth chapter of the first book of his *De Trinitate* is significant: *De Synodis Catholicis, quarum decreto Spiritus sancti divinitas est constituta, Alexandrina, Illyriciana, Romana sub Damaso, tum Constantinopolitana, Plerosque Catholicos Spiritum sanctum Deum aperte profiteri ausos non fuisse; ac ne Constantinopolitanam quidem oecumenicam diserte Deum appellasse.* In the third book he gives some attention to the views of Photius and his followers, then defends the doctrine of the Deity of the Holy Spirit against the attacks of the Socinian minister, John Crell.[2]

II

The testimony of English Protestantism in the first half of the seventeenth century, if we omit the Socinian elements, was wholly on the side of the accepted teaching as to the full Godhead of the Spirit, and thus proved invaluable when the more deliberate onslaughts on the Trinitarian position came to be made. In a reference to the Lord's sending of 'another Comforter' to the disciples, which would be gain to them rather than loss, Andrewes touches on 'the equality of the Holy Ghost. For sending and procuring, He must send and procure them One equal to Himself, as good every way, or else they

[1] *De Mysterio Trinitatis*, iii.

[2] In his *De Uno Deo Patre*, i. 3, *argum.* 1 (published 1631, two years before his death), Crell denies that Acts v. 3 f. gives the impression that the Holy Spirit is God, for Peter speaks of the Holy Spirit in one way, and of God in another. Again, the fact that our body is called the temple of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. vi. 19) shows only the personality, and not necessarily the Godhead, of the Spirit.

had changed for the worse.'[1] That other great Anglican preacher, John Donne, is equally explicit. 'The Holy Ghost, the third Person in the Trinity,' is 'yet not third so as that either second or first, Son or Father, were one minute before Him in that co-eternity that enwraps Them all alike.'[2] 'The Holy Spirit,' he asserts, 'has the same majesty as the Father and the Son.'[3] The essential Deity of the Spirit can be reasonably inferred from the account of the Baptism of Jesus, though it is not expressly declared therein.[4] So Cartwright believes, adding, in another comment, that the Holy Spirit can be none other than God, to teach the faithful inwardly of the things of Christ.[5] *The Irish Articles* and *The Westminster Confession* give their adhesion to the same view, though in the formal manner usually characterizing such documents: the former stating that 'the Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God';[6] and the latter that 'religious worship is to be given to God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and to Him alone.'[7] In these declarations there is naturally nothing new, but they serve to show the steadiness of the Church's witness to the accepted doctrine both in Great Britain and in Ireland. Reference may also be made to a typical remark of Cudworth's that Plato 'makes the third hypostasis of his trinity likewise to be ὁμοούσιος, "co-essential" with the second; as he elsewhere made the second co-essential with the first.'[8]

Socinian attackers had been regarding the profession of the Spirit's Deity as one of their main objectives, and, in face of their criticisms which had been issuing from the press, defenders of the doctrine came forward of whom the Christian Church was justly proud. Bishop Pearson was the first note-

[1] *Sermon* 3 *on the Holy Spirit* (John xiv. 15, 16; May 27, 1610). He speaks of a 'subordination' in his *Responsio ad Cardinalis Bellarmini Apologiam*, but only in regard to order.

[2] *Sermon* 28 (John xiv. 26; Whit-Sunday 1627).

[3] *Sermon* 29 (John xiv. 26; Whit-Sunday 1628).

[4] *Harmonia Evangelica* (on Matt. iii. 13–17).

[5] *Ibid.* (on John xiv. 21–27).

[6] *Art.* 10.

[7] xxi. 2.

[8] *True Intellectual System of the Universe*, iv. 36 (vol. ii. p. 388, 1845 ed.). Mosheim notes that he quotes from Plato's *Cratylus*, which is, he feels, 'dragged into the present question without the least reason.'

worthy champion of the doctrine to appear, his *Exposition of the Creed* proving a severe blow to the Socinian party. 'The Holy Ghost, in whose name we are baptized, and in whom we profess to believe, is,' he insists, 'not a created, but a Divine and uncreated Person. . . . The Holy Ghost is a Person . . . and is not of a nature distinguished from that which is in God; . . . therefore He is no created person. . . . The Holy Ghost is such a One as against whom a sin may be committed (Acts v. 3 f.), and, when it is so, it cannot be remitted (Matt. xii. 31 f.). But if He were no Person, we could not commit that sin against Him, and, if He were a created person, the sin committed against Him could not be irremissible. Therefore He is a Person, and that uncreated.' To this he adds that the Holy Spirit was not created by the Son of God as were all created persons, 'therefore the Spirit of God can be no created person.' Further, 'He, by whose operation Christ was conceived in the womb of the Virgin, was no created person; for by virtue of that conception He was called the Son of God.'[1] 'Our third assertion,' he resumes, 'is that which necessarily followeth from the former two [concerning the personality and the uncreated nature of the Spirit], that the Spirit of God, in whose name we are baptized, and in whom we profess to believe, is properly and truly God. . . . If He be a Person not created . . . then must He of necessity be acknowledged to be God, because there is no uncreated essence beside the essence of the one eternal God.' Moreover, the Divine attributes 'belong as certainly to the Holy Ghost as they do unto God the Father'; therefore He is 'truly and properly God.' Again, 'such works as are proper unto God . . . are attributed often in the Scriptures to the Spirit of God,' and on that account He is 'properly and truly God.' 'The Scriptures do clearly manifest the same Spirit to be God, and term Him plainly and expressly so. For when Peter said, "Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost?" (Acts v. 3), he repeateth the same question in reference to the same offence, "Why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God" (Acts v. 4).

[1] *Exposition of the Creed, Art. viii.* i. § 2. Evidently he has not in mind the dogma of the Eternal Generation of the Son, which does not regard the Divine Sonship of Christ as depending on His Incarnation but rather as being revealed and expressed by it.

To lie unto the Holy Ghost is to lie unto God.'[1] This is the direct negative of the interpretation put upon this passage by Socinian writers, already seen in the footnote on John Crell, as is also a reference made to it in each of the two great theological works of John Owen. The Holy Spirit, according to Owen, ' is directly affirmed to be, and is called, God's in these same verses in Acts.[2] Scriptural evidence clearly shows that He is God just as the Father is God and the Son is God.[3] Scripture ' declareth also that He is the Author and Worker of all sorts of Divine operations requiring immensity, omnipotency, omnisciency, and all other Divine excellencies.'[4] If, as must be admitted, expressions such as that the Holy Spirit is ' given ' or ' sent ' do not prove the Divinity of the Spirit, neither do they disprove it, as the Socinians seek to establish ; for they are used ' with respect unto the holy dispensation and condescension wherein He hath undertaken the office of being our Comforter and our Sanctifier.'[5] On the other hand, the very name of ' *Holy* Spirit ' points to His Godhead, for ' sanctification is His peculiar work,' and ' it is God alone who sanctifieth His people (Lev. xx. 8).'[6] Similarly Beveridge remarks that the Holy Spirit is called ' holy ' because He is ' the fountain and author of holiness in us ' ;[7] and Bunyan, that ' the Spirit is God, as the Father and the Son, and is therefore also the Author of grace.'[8] The very work of the Spirit reflects upon the Being of the Worker, and this was a kind of defence which was becoming more prevalent among orthodox arguments. Perhaps the very line of argument undertaken by Bishop Bull, namely, an ' apology ' for one of the ancient creeds, would lead us to expect simply a familiar form of Trinitarian statement : even so, the familiar form carried great weight just because it was Bull's. His summarized conclusions are that the Holy Spirit, being a Person distinct from the Father and the Son, is equal

[1] *Exposition of the Creed, Art. viii.* i. § 3.

[2] *A Brief Declaration and Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, p. 92 ; and *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, pp. 93 f.

[3] *Vindication*, p. 33.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 93.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 103 f.

[6] *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, p. 50.

[7] *Theologicus Thesaurus*, i (*Articles of the Christian Faith*). See also his note on Lk. xxiv. 49.

[8] *Saved by Grace* (*Works*, ed. Blackie, vol. i).

to Them both, and is therefore to be worshipped as God. Since He is 'less' than the Father and the Son merely in respect of source, His Divinity in the highest sense is beyond question; and, since He has always been co-existent with Them, He could not be 'less' than They in any other respect whatever.[1] If Owen's testimony be correct, the Socinians were shifting their ground, in the course of the first part of the Trinitarian Controversy, from reasoning against the Spirit's Deity to reasoning against His personality; but when he says that the folly of denying the Deity of the Holy Spirit 'is so evident that it is almost by all utterly deserted,'[2] he was probably too optimistic.

Sherlock's theory of mutual consciousness as explaining the Divine Triunity, controversial though it proved to be, certainly postulates equality among the Divine Persons,[3] and the subordination which he taught, 'as of a derivative to an original,' is no negation of this.[4] 'The Spirit of God,' he states, 'is as essentially God as the spirit of a man is essential to a man.'[5] Godhead is distinctly ascribed in the New Testament to the Holy Spirit, as also is a Divine Unity to the three Persons, without confusion.[6] Sherlock's position is therefore quite clear, and the whole of the debate between the so-called 'real' and 'nominal' Trinitarians assumed the Deity of the Spirit from beginning to end. Stillingfleet, while attempting to bring about an understanding between these two parties, paid more attention to their common enemy, the Unitarians; and Matthew Henry, another who touches deliberately on the Spirit's Godhead, had more time to do so than had Stillingfleet. Both of them attach great importance to scriptural evidence. Stillingfleet writes: 'Must we reject those Scriptures which attribute Divinity to the Son and Holy Ghost as well as to the Father? That we cannot do, unless we cast off those books of Scripture wherein those things are contained.'[7] That being clearly impossible, Matthew Henry takes

1 *Defensio Fidei Nicenae.*
2 *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, p. 66.
3 *A Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, p. 58.
4 *Ibid.*, p. 82.
5 *Ibid.*, p. 198. This is reinforced by the instance of the use of the threefold Name in baptism, p. 211.
6 *A Defence of Dr. Sherlock's Notion of a Trinity in Unity.*
7 *A Discourse in Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, p. 113.

the opportunity in his *Exposition of the New Testament* to comment on certain of the passages in question. We read that baptism, beside being administered into the name of the Father and the Son, ' is into the name of the Holy Ghost. Believing the Godhead of the Holy Spirit, and His agency in carrying on our redemption, we give up ourselves to His conduct and operation as our Sanctifier, Teacher, Guide, and Comforter.' [1] Mention of the sin against the Holy Spirit implies His Deity, and therefore ' blasphemous words against the Holy Ghost are the worst kind of tongue-sins, and unpardonable.' These sins of the tongue are, however, sins of the heart, of the inner life—a truth which may be at once condemning and consoling, according to the real intention of the soul. ' We have reason to think,' he says, ' that none are guilty of this sin who believe that Christ is the Son of God, and sincerely desire to have part in His merit and mercy; and those who fear they have committed this sin give a good sign that they have not.' [2]

III

The Unitarian Controversy in both its stages kept the doctrine of the Godhead of the Spirit in a prominent place as one of the chief points of discussion. The careful manner in which Samuel Clarke began to treat this subject is very noticeable, and was obviously meant to disarm suspicion. ' The Scripture,' he writes, ' speaking of the Spirit of God . . . presupposes Him to have existed with the Father from the beginning.' [3] ' Concerning the Holy Spirit there are other greater things spoken in Scripture, and higher titles ascribed to Him than to any angel or other created being whatsoever.' [4] Both these statements, however, in spite of appearances, carry with them no admission of the Spirit's Deity on the part of Clarke, but merely show the very difficulty of the Unitarian position. This becomes clear as he proceeds. ' Whatever honour is paid to the Son who redeemed, or to the Holy Spirit who sanctifies us, must always be understood as tending finally to the honour and glory of the Father, by whose good pleasure the

[1] *Exposition of the New Testament*, on Matt. xxviii. 19.
[2] *Ibid.*, on Matt. xii. 31, 32.
[3] *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, ii. § 20.
[4] *Ibid.*, § 31.

Son redeemed, and the Holy Spirit sanctifies us.' [1] The word 'finally' is distinctly derogatory to the idea of a Divine Trinity, and the statement itself is a denial of the full Deity of the Son and the Spirit, in virtue of which They Themselves would equally receive honour and glory; for the honouring of the Father tends just as certainly to the honouring of the Son (see John v. 23). Further, 'the Holy Spirit, as He is subordinate to the Father, so He is also in Scripture represented as subordinate to the Son, both by Nature and by the will of the Father; excepting only that He is described as being the Conductor and Guide of the Lord during His state of humiliation here upon earth.' [2] Subordination in respect of Nature, and not simply in respect of source, is decidedly anti-Trinitarian, as also are the statements that the Spirit derives both His Being and His powers from the Father,[3] and therefore always acts as He is commanded by Him.[4]

John Edwards begins his *Animadversions on Dr. Clarke's Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity* with a reference to Clarke and Whiston as having gone over to the 'modern Unitarians and Socinians.' 'It is manifest,' he observes, 'that their principal undertaking is that of Crellius [Crell], the most noted and considerable assertor of the Socinian cause, that God the Father alone is the true and supreme God.' From Matt. xix. 17 ('One there is who is good'), Clarke 'infers that God the Father only is good, and consequently neither the Son nor the Holy Ghost is good; which yet he disallows afterwards, when he comes to himself. . . . When God in Scripture is said to be "one" or "only," it is not said in contradistinction to the Son or the Holy Ghost, but against those who, though they are not gods, yet are falsely so-called.' Clarke also cites Romans xvi. 27 ('to the only wise God') and 1 Tim. i. 17 ('the only God') with intent to show that Godhead truly inheres in the Father only: 'but,' remarks Edwards, 'if there be any force of reason and argument in these words, then neither the Son nor the Holy Ghost is wise; which either the Doctor must blasphemously assert, or else he must own he alleges these texts impertinently.' [5] It is very specious of Clarke, in Edwards's opinion, to state that the Son and the Spirit

1 *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, ii. § 45. 2 *Ibid.*, § 42.
3 *Ibid.*, §§ 19, 40. 4 *Ibid.*, § 41. 5 *Animadversions*, chap. i.

existed 'from the beginning,' but he is careful not to state that They existed 'from eternity.' The fact is, declares Edwards, that Clarke 'will not suffer the Holy Ghost to be called God, because he saith, "The word 'God' in Scripture nowhere signifies the Person of the Holy Ghost" . . . But in this he leaves the ancient writers, who hold that the Holy Spirit is expressly called God in Acts v. 4 . . . and 1 Cor. iii. 16. And all Christian antiquity declares, from these and other plain texts, that the Spirit is truly and properly God, and is of the same Essence with the Father and the Son, and is honoured and worshipped alike with Them.'[1] But 'the Doctor . . . will not let us give the same glory, honour, and worship to the Son and Holy Ghost which is given to the Father. "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost!" must be changed into "Glory be to the Father, in or by the Son, and in the Holy Ghost!"'[2] To Gastrell all this can only mean that, in Clarke's view, the three Persons of the Trinity are of a different Nature: 'and for that reason, as I apprehend, it is that the word "God" is not by him thought applicable to the second and third Person in the same sense as it is to the first. Whereas the received opinion of our Church is that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are one and the same God, individually the same, of the same Nature, Substance, and perfections.' Accordingly 'the word "God" is applicable to the Son and to the Holy Ghost in the same sense as it is to the Father, not only from the use of the word "God" in Scripture, but from the titles, perfections, and powers there ascribed to Them.'[3]

In his *Second Vindication of Christ's Divinity* Waterland observes that it is out of his compass to treat of the Divinity of the Holy Ghost,[4] but he does so constantly in no very indirect manner, as, indeed, he was bound to do in view of statements made by the 'Country Clergyman,' his principal opponent, such as that 'the word "God" nowhere in Scripture denotes the Holy Ghost.'[5] The 'Country Clergyman' is careful to avoid any recommendation of tritheism, but Waterland insists that 'one supreme, and two inferior Gods' is his

1 *Animadversions*, chap. iii.
2 His observations on Clarke's book, part iii.
3 *Remarks upon Dr. Clarke's Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity.*
4 *Ibid.*, p. 353. 5 *Ibid.*, p. 443.

avowed doctrine.[1] Such an interpretation of subordination within the Trinity cannot be allowed for an instant [2]: it would mean polytheism, pure and simple.[3] And if attempts are made to deny the Deity of the Holy Spirit altogether, they are at once countered by the testimony of Scripture. Neither John xvii. 3 ('Thee, the only true God'), nor 1 Cor. viii. 6 ('There is one God, the Father'), nor Eph. iv. 6 ('One God and Father of all') can rightly be construed as excluding from Godhead the Son and the Holy Ghost; and if They cannot be excluded, They must each be Supreme God.[4] Similarly, the will of God, considered absolutely, is generally understood to be the will of the Father; but this is no ground for denying the Godhead of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.[5] These are 'God in the very highest sense,' the name 'God,' by itself, being usually regarded as referring to the Father simply on account of His 'existing from none,'[6] even as the name 'Spirit' is usually regarded as referring to the Holy Ghost.[7] Christianity knows only of God in this highest sense, or in no sense at all. 'Scripture, and generally Antiquity, say nothing of a *supreme* God, because they acknowledge no *inferior* God.'[8] Subordination merely in order or in office may be admitted, but this in no way affects the question of Godhead;[9] and the 'Country Clergyman' is altogether misleading in his confusion of the terms 'supreme in order' and 'supreme in Nature.'[10] 'I am fully and unalterably persuaded,' writes Waterland, 'that the true and right way is to admit the subordination, and to assert the essential Divinity of all the three Persons together with it. Both parts appear to be founded in Scripture, and were undoubtedly believed by the Ancients in general.'[11] While, then, the Arians frankly make the Son and Holy Ghost two creatures,' in direct opposition to Scripture and Antiquity,'[12] the Christian standpoint maintains the necessary existence, consubstantiality, co-eternity, and the other Divine attributes of the Holy Ghost,[13] which the fact that He is third in order leaves entirely untouched.[14]

1 *Vindication*, p. 337 (query 22).
2 *Ibid.*, query 1.
3 *Ibid.*, query 3.
4 *Ibid.*, query 2.
5 *Ibid.*, p. 69 (query 3).
6 *Second Vindication*, p. 53.
7 *Ibid.*, pp. 54, 189.
8 *Ibid.*, p. 196.
9 *Ibid.*, pp. 172, 181.
10 *Ibid.*, pp. 434 ff.
11 *Ibid.*, p. 531.
12 *Farther Vindication*, pp. 4, 11, 19, 42.
13 *Ibid.*, p. 12.
14 *Ibid.*, pp. 43 ff.

The revival of the Unitarian Controversy by Priestley shows that discussion still centres on this subject of subordination. Priestley, who constantly reveals his indebtedness to Clarke, states that, for some time, the Early Church maintained a subordination of the Son and the Holy Spirit to the Father as a defence against polytheistic tendencies, certain of its theologians 'alleging one circumstance of this inferiority, and others another.'[1] Horsley, in his reply, at once concedes a subordination within the Trinity, and points out that this is necessary to the preservation of the Divine Unity. In this he follows Pearson, Waterland, and other Trinitarian writers. But, like them, he makes it clear that such subordination relates alone to order and office: there is no subordination in respect of 'duration and dignity.'[2] 'Differences there must be,' he says, 'lest we confound the Persons, which was the error of Sabellius. But the differences can only consist in the personal properties.'[3] From the side of Mysticism, Boehme supports the Trinitarian position. In the course of the *Aurora*, his famous study of the Divine Nature, he speaks of 'God, the Holy Ghost,' the uncreated will of the Deity, eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son. He it is who 'replenishes the whole Father; He is nothing less or greater than the Father and the Son; His moving power is in the whole Father.'[4] And the subject of the Deity of the Holy Spirit is, as has already been noticed, not one of metaphysics alone, nor even of Scripture references alone. Personal experience enters in, for, as Butler puts it, the obligations to worship the Son and the Holy Spirit are 'obligations of reason,' arising out of the very relations in which They stand to us.[5] Wesley, it may be observed, makes reference to a much-quoted text, Acts v. 3 ff., as that in which 'the Godhead of the Holy Spirit evidently appears, since lying to Him is lying to God.'[6] But Wesley's principal contribution to this subject is found throughout his emphatic teaching on the work of the Spirit, which rests altogether upon an assumption of His Deity. In face of the Unitarian menace —so-regarded, stimulated as it had been by later Arminian

[1] *A History of the Corruptions of Christianity*, i. p. 63.
[2] *Tracts in Controversy with Dr. Priestley* (*Letters*), pp. 292 ff.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 296.
[4] § 3.
[5] *Analogy*, ii. 1.
[6] *Notes on the N.T.*

theology with its overemphasis of 'subordination,' the Church produced able vindications of the Godhead of the Spirit; but by no means the least impressive of these was the Methodist insistence, doctrinally and practically, on the saving and sanctifying operations of the Spirit as being necessarily the operations of God Himself. The Divine character of such operations presupposes the Divine Nature of their Author. This had been said centuries before by Thomas Aquinas.

III

THE PLACE OF THE SPIRIT IN THE ABSOLUTE TRINITY

'Religion is not a thing to be coined and recoined every month; it has been thought on long and well, and by persons blessed with as good a share of understanding, and as great sincerity, as any are, or have been: and the generality of the wisest and most excellent men have hitherto gone on in such a way, and that, too, after a strict and severe examination, being well apprized of the objections made against it.'—DANIEL WATERLAND.

III

THE PLACE OF THE SPIRIT IN THE ABSOLUTE TRINITY

I

The belief that the immanent Life of God is tripersonal has been maintained and developed in the connected thought of the Church Universal since the Age of the Fathers. It is a belief founded on revelation and systematized by reason. It contains too many mysteries for the finite mind, ever to have been *based* on reason ; on the other hand, the theologians of the Church have for centuries felt that it is the most reasonable exposition of the facts set forth in Scripture, and the only true induction from all that they infer. When, then, Dr. Gardner so confidently asserts the doctrine of the Trinity to be ' a conventional and scholastic summary of doctrines which have in themselves great value, but which gain little from being tied up in a bundle,' [1] he surely overlooks the long course of development in connexion with the doctrine, which is found in its earliest stage within the bounds of the New Testament itself ; while many an expounder of the doctrine, who has readily acknowledged the limitations in writing of such a mystery, would never have thought of the suggestion of its being constructed for human *convenience*—which is usually why bundles exist ! It was regarded, by the theologians of the period under review as also by their predecessors, as being beyond intellectual comprehension, but nevertheless as pointing to mysteries which might at least be intellectually conceived. The Greeks continued to feel that they could frame such conceptions without calling in the aid of Trinitarian analogies : perhaps, in view of their more speculative outlook, this is not surprising. In the West, such analogical treatment as there was—with but occasional exceptions, such as that found in Boehme—followed the psychological line originally favoured by Augustine, the threefold nature which man possesses, however variously described,

[1] Percy Gardner, *The Practical Basis of Christian Belief* (1923), pp. 223 f.

being held to indicate a threefold Nature in his Creator.[1] This indication, always merely suggestive, pointed equally to the Unity of God as to the Trinity, particularly in the case of the psychological analogies. The Church's insistence on the reality of the mutual relations within the Divine Unity has been the safeguard against the Sabellian danger, for, in Professor Moberly's words, 'any thought of mutual relationship between aspects of one, which differ only as aspects, would be wholly impossible.'[2] Likewise has it been the safeguard against Arian tendencies, as the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries clearly illustrate.

The *Formula of Concord* and *Canons of Dort* pass on the general consensus of Mediaeval and Reformation opinion, the former referring to the 'most holy mystery' of the one most simple and common Essence in the Trinity, in which three distinct Persons consist;[3] and the latter being content to state the same belief in the accustomed terminology.[4] Later Arminianism, too, was concerned to emphasize the unity of the Trinity, apparently with no feeling of inconsistency on account of its 'subordinationism.' Episcopius writes: 'In Himself absolutely, God must be regarded primarily as One, that is, not only in that unity by which He is undivided in Himself and distinguished from all else; . . . but also in that unity by which God is One and only One (*solus atque unicus*), which means that He possesses an Essence that is devoid of multiplication and division, to which no other essence is equal';[5] for God is a spiritual Essence.[6] 'The Divine Essence,' he resumes, 'is most simple. . . . And it in no sense follows, since relations and full distinctions (*decreta*) are united in the Divine Essence, that therefore the Divine Essence Itself is, within Itself, composed of parts (*composita*). For that union of

[1] Dr. E. S. Waterhouse (*Philosophy of Religious Experience* (1923), p. 255) is of opinion that the fact that God responds to our personal approaches, and that we can hold communion with the nature of reality such as exists between persons, 'tends toward an interpretation of the nature of the ground of reality after the analogy of a nature that responds to ours.' It seems that this may also be taken in a Trinitarian sense.

[2] *Atonement and Personality* (1900), p. 86.

[3] 'Una tantum eademque simplicissima in augustissimo illo Trinitatis mysterio communis essentia reperiatur, quae totam in se deitatis continet perfectionem: tres vero proprietates personales, quibus tres personae constituuntur ac inter sese distinguuntur.'

[4] ii. 4. [5] *Institutiones Theologicæ*, lib. iv. sect. ii. § 2. [6] *Ibid.*, § 3.

relations, and of distinctions or free-wills, because an Essence, does not mean that the Divine Essence Itself is composed of (*ex*) the relations and free-wills ; but, at the utmost, it means that the Divine Essence, remaining most simple within Itself . . . may, on account of these relations and wills and distinctions, be conceived apart from any alteration or change of Its own.' The Divine Essence, which is God, is indivisible,[1] eternal and immutable,[2] omnipotent,[3] and omnipresent.[4] This is reminiscent of Peter the Lombard's attitude, which was upheld by the Fourth Lateran Council,[5] though it is somewhat doubtful, with Arminian ' subordinationism ' in mind, that the two meant the same thing. In regard to Episcopius, his very emphasis on the Divine Unity appears to be based entirely on the ' supremacy ' of the Father in the Trinity. This cannot be asserted with confidence in the case of Grotius, in whose *Truth of the Christian Religion*, written for travellers in Mohammedan countries, the oneness of God receives full treatment ;[6] but it can be asserted very definitely of Curcellaeus. In the first seventeen chapters of the second book of his *Institutio Religionis Christianae*, the latter describes the attributes of the one God, in the eighteenth chapter saying : ' We declare that God is One, meaning that He is of such a Nature as is not only one in Itself, but is also unable to augment (*multiplicare*) or be divided into several parts. The unity of God is proved, firstly, by the express testimonies of Holy Scripture, which occur here and there in great number in the Old, as in the New, Testament. . . . Secondly, plain reasons prove it.' [7] But Curcellaeus declares that the unity of God cannot satisfactorily be explained by the ' novel distinction ' that God is One in Essence and Three in Persons, ' which, as it cannot be rightly understood by any one, so it cannot be clearly anyone's opinion.' Such unity can more truly be appreciated from the statement that ' There is only one Father and most high God, who is the Source and Origin of the Godhead of the Son and the Holy Spirit.' [8] In Limborch's view, the Divine Unity is not composed of several Persons of the same origin or order assembled

1 *Institutiones Theologicæ, Ibid.*, 7. 2 *Ibid.*, 9. 3 *Ibid.*, 12. 4 *Ibid.*, 13.

5 See *The Holy Spirit in the Mediaeval Church*, pp. 121 ff.

6 Though, as Dr. Fisher points out (*History of Christian Doctrine*, p. 340), he relies more upon the testimony of externals than upon that of the Holy Spirit.

7 Also see the *Dissertatio*, § 109. 8 *Dissertatio*, § 37.

together.[1] 'It is that,' he says, 'by which God is not only undivided in Himself, and divided from all else, but also that by which His Essence is devoid of multiplication; so that He is One and only One (*solus ac unicus*), and beside Him there is no God.'[2] This argument is developed at some length, and he proceeds to show that the 'indivisible Subsistence,' namely God, is indivisible and therefore One since the three Persons are all of a Divine order.[3] His 'subordinationism' was not pressed so far as that of Curcellaeus, neither was that of Le Clerc, but both these held it as a safeguard of the Divine Unity. A pamphlet entitled *An Abstract and Judgement of Dr. Clarke's* (*Rector of St. James's*) *Polemical or Controversial Writings. . . . By Mr. Le Clerc, Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Amsterdam* (*translated from the French, London*, 1713), which was meant to still the storm which Samuel Clarke had aroused, illustrates this statement. 'We ought to behave ourselves,' he writes, 'with abundance of moderation and temper upon this occasion, in judging of the opinions and sentiments of others. And if we are not to condemn and damn the Ancients for embracing an opinion which supposes three distinct Substances, and, by consequence, three Gods; though this name be given the Father in a more exalted sense, and hereby the Unity of the supreme Being secured; neither ought we to condemn the present Christian world for owning one individual Substance in the Persons of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.' The Arminian doctrine that a real supremacy of the Father secures the Divine Unity is here very clearly put. Where, however, Le Clerc, being a professor of ecclesiastical history, could have gleaned the information that the Ancient Church taught a Trinity of three Substances, it is impossible to discover; for such teaching, involving, as Le Clerc states, belief in tritheism, was firmly repudiated by both the Cappadocian Gregorys, and was never entertained by the Fathers. Yet he proceeds to argue: 'If it is thought hard to accuse the Ancients as being tritheists, neither ought we to term the present Christians

[1] 'Unitas autem quando Deo tribuitur, non intelligitur generica, nec specifica, quae est plurium quae eodem genere seu specie conveniunt sub eodem conceptu comprehensio.'

[2] *Theologia Christiana*, ii. § 3. Divine attributes follow, §§ 4–16.

[3] 'Tribus hisce tribuuntur divinae perfectiones. Unde concludimus Deitatem tribus hisce esse communem.'—*Ibid.*, § 7.

"Sabellians" or "Socinians." But it were much better to be silent and to say nothing, than afresh to inflame men's minds with disputes, the consequences of which we have already seen to prove so fatal in former ages, and that may possibly do so again.' That Le Clerc accepted his own advice as regards reticence on points of Trinitarian doctrine is apparent in his *Notes* on Hammond's *Paraphrase of the New Testament*; but since he felt impelled to send an eirenicon across to England he might have made it more convincing.

French Protestantism and Roman Catholicism bring the student back to the main line of development. Petavius, as representing the latter, gives in his *De Trinitate* (lib. iv) a historical survey of the doctrines of the Trinity and of the Procession, as also of the various terms (*substantia*, *persona*, &c.) used in reference thereto. Amyraut, of the Saumur school, is certainly fresher. He suggests that the reason for naming the third Person of the Trinity the 'Spirit' is that His source and mode of procession are somewhat more obscure (*paulo occultior*) than in the case of the generation of the Son, 'for it is more difficult to explain how He as Love proceeds from Both, namely the Father and the Son, than how the Son is begotten by the Father.' On the whole subject of the Trinity he writes: 'We are accustomed so to talk of that mystery as also to say that the operations which function *outside* of the Essence of God are common to the three Persons. And in respect of those things which take place *within* the Essence of God Itself, we consider that the operations of the Persons are so distinct and "separate" in themselves that they cannot be shared among Them. The Father, therefore, begets; not the Son. The Son is begotten, but not the Father. The Spirit proceeds from Both, but neither of Them proceeds from the Spirit.' In the one Deity, then, there are three Persons, just as in the soul (*anima*) there are mind (*mens*), understanding (*intelligentia*), and will (*voluntas*), and in an equilateral triangle there are three equal angles—which was one of Roger Bacon's illustrations. 'But the Essence of God is so truly One as to tolerate no kind of division, not even a division made by mental reasoning.' [1] In writing thus Amyraut had the Arminians in mind.

[1] *De Mysterio Trinitatis*, part iii. The argument is supported by quotations from Scripture and the Fathers, with explanations, in parts iv to vii.

II

In the realm of historical theology Hooker largely played the part of intermediary between the mediaeval age and the age which followed. He summarizes the principal conclusions on the doctrines of the Trinity and the Holy Spirit, some of his reasoning being familiar in sound to a reader of the Schoolmen. But Hooker proved to be more than a doctrinal intermediary. The maturity of his judgement and the profundity of his scholarship are both evident in the way in which he passed on the belief of the Church, so helping to strengthen existing foundations which should withstand the approaching storms. His principal concern appears to be to emphasize the Unity of God, within which the generation of the Son and the procession of the Spirit are 'natural, necessary, and internal operations.' 'Our God is One,' he writes, 'or rather very Oneness, and mere Unity, having nothing but itself in itself, and not consisting (as all things do besides God) of many things. In which essential unity of God a Trinity personal nevertheless subsisteth, after a manner far exceeding the possibility of man's conceit. The works which outwardly are of God, they are in such sort of Him being One that each Person hath in them somewhat peculiar and proper. For being Three, and They all subsisting in the Essence of one Deity; from the Father, by the Son, through the Spirit all things are.'[1] In a later 'book' in the same work he continues: '"The Lord our God is but one God" (Deut. vi. 4); in which indivisible unity notwithstanding, we adore the Father as being altogether of Himself, we glorify that consubstantial Word which is the Son, we bless and magnify that co-essential Spirit eternally proceeding from Both, which is the Holy Ghost. Seeing, therefore, the Father is of none, the Son is of the Father, and the Spirit is of Both, They are by these Their several properties really distinguishable each from other. . . . Every Person hath His own subsistence which no other besides hath, although there be others besides that are of the same Substance.' The several properties of the one Substance are the cause of the personal distinctions, the property of proceeding, for example, causing the Divine Substance to be the Person of the Holy

[1] *Ecclesiastical Polity*, Bk. i. chap. 2, § 2.

Ghost.[1] This he emphasizes in a later paragraph on the unity of God: 'Since They [the Persons of the Godhead] all are but one God in number, one indivisible Essence or Substance, Their distinction cannot possibly admit separation. For how should that subsist solitarily by itself which hath no substance but individually the very same whereby others subsist with it; seeing that the multiplication of substances *in particular* is necessarily required to make those things subsist apart which have the self-same general nature, and the Persons of that Trinity are not three particular Substances to whom one *general* Nature is common, but Three that subsist by one Substance *which Itself is particular*, yet They all Three have It, and Their several *ways* of having It are that which maketh Their personal distinction? The Father, therefore, is in the Son, and the Son in Him, They Both in the Spirit, and the Spirit in both Them.'[2] The above passages were subjected to criticism by John Wallis, in his anonymous pamphlet on the Trinity (1693), who quotes Peter the Lombard as saying, 'Essentia Divina non est generans, nec generata, nec procedens,' and adds, ''Tis impossible to make this consist with Mr. Hooker, who expressly ascribeth those properties to the Divine Substance or Essence.' The endorsement of the Lombard's Trinitarian teaching by the Fourth Lateran Council[3] shows that Hooker can be reconciled with him without much difficulty. The Council laid down that, while the Substance is not begetting, nor begotten, nor proceeding, as are the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, It is Itself Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and, at the same time, is *either* Father, Son, *or* Holy Spirit. Hooker's exposition is, however, unusual, though essentially in agreement with the accepted doctrine. It would seem, according to his emphasis, that the Substance of the Deity is the bond of the Father and the Son, rather than the Holy Spirit, but Andrewes reminds us of the accustomed manner of setting forth this, when he teaches that 'The Holy Ghost . . . the third Person in the Trinity . . . is the very essential unity, love, and love-knot of the two Persons, the Father and the Son; even of God with God'[4]—an addition

1 *Ecclesiastical Polity*, Bk. v. chap. 51, § 1.
2 *Ibid.*, chap. 56, § 2.
3 See *The Holy Spirit in the Mediaeval Church*, pp. 122 ff.
4 *Sermon* 1 *on the Holy Spirit* (Acts ii. 1–4, June 8, 1606).

which might not have quite commended itself to Hooker. The eighth article of the *Irish Articles of Religion* merely gives a formal definition of the Trinity, but the ninth supports both Peter the Lombard and Hooker in the statement: 'The Essence of the Father doth not beget the Essence of the Son; but the Person of the Father begetteth the Person of the Son, by communicating His whole Essence to the Person begotten from eternity.' This insistence on the Divine Unity is also found in the *Westminster Confession*, which declares that 'in the unity of the Godhead,' described as 'a most pure Spirit,' 'there be three Persons, of one Substance, power, and eternity.'[1] So Chillingworth asserts that it is impossible to confound the Persons or to divide the Substance, 'because Three remaining Three cannot be confounded, and One remaining One cannot be divided.'[2]

Encouraged by the suggestiveness of the Platonic philosophy and the teaching of ancient religions, the Cambridge Platonists felt themselves on firm ground when upholding the revealed truth of the Trinity against Deistic propagandists. The truth of the doctrine was in the forefront of Cudworth's thought when he wrote his *True Intellectual System of the Universe*, for, in the preface, he makes three preliminary affirmations: 'First, that it [the Holy Trinity] is not a trinity of mere names and words, or of logical notions only; but of Persons or hypostases. Secondly, that none of those Persons or hypostases are creatures, but all uncreated. And lastly, that They are all Three truly and really one God.'[3] It was natural that Cudworth should stress the unity of the Trinity in writing against the Deists, when it is remembered that those philosophers, with their teaching of 'natural religion,' were, in point of fact, deriving support from the dissemination of Unitarian ideas. Accordingly, after referring in his book to the subject of God in creation, he proceeds: 'From the idea of God thus declared, it evidently appears that there can be but one such Being, and that μόνωσις, unity, oneliness, or singularity is essential to it; forasmuch as there cannot possibly be more than one supreme, more than one omnipotent or infinitely powerful

[1] ii. §§ 1 and 3.

[2] *Religion of Protestants*, iv. 46. Baxter in his *Christian Directory* (pt. i, on *Christian Ethics*) iii. 4, sums up the Church's doctrine of the Trinity in tabular form.

[3] p. 43 of the preface (1845 ed.).

Being, and more than one cause of all things besides itself.' [1] 'The more intelligent of the ancient pagans, notwithstanding the multiplicity of gods worshipped by them, did generally acknowledge one supreme, omnipotent, and only unmade Deity.' [2] But Cudworth is anxious to show that the Deity is equally One while an internal Trinity is revealed and taught, and, in this connexion, he declares that it must not be thought 'that the whole Trinity is one, after the very same manner that each single Person thereof is in itself one, for then should there be a trinity also in each Person. Nor that it is so called undivided as if three were not three in it (which is to make the mystery contemptible); but because all the three hypostases, or Persons, are indivisibly and inseparably united to each other . . . and really but one God.' [3] The Divine Triunity, so much pressed by these English theologians of the earlier years of the seventeenth century, was an important truth to be remembered in view of the increasing Socinian propaganda.

III

When the first part of the Trinitarian Controversy opened, those who undertook the defence of the doctrine of the Trinity evidently felt that the primary need was a full explanation of the doctrine, so that no occasion might be given to the Socinian party to charge the Church with lack of courage or of reason. Pearson in his *Exposition of the Creed* adopts this policy very frankly. He perceives that Socinian policy is, partly, to discredit the doctrine of the Trinity by disproving the 'personality' of the Holy Spirit, thereby arriving at a Binity which, in turn, could be attacked. This particular kind of onslaught he at once counters. 'The Spirit of God,' he writes, 'which is the true living God, is neither God the Father, nor the Son of God. . . . The Holy Ghost "proceedeth from the Father" (John xv. 26). Therefore He is not the Father. . . . The Holy Ghost is not the Son; for He which receiveth of that which is the Son's, and by receiving of it glorifieth the Son, cannot be the Son (John xvi. 14; xvi. 7). . . . The Scriptures frequently represent Him [the Holy Ghost] as distinguished both from

[1] *The True Intellectual System of the Universe*, iv. 10 (vol. i. p. 316, 1845 ed.).
[2] *Ibid.*, 15 (i. p. 436).
[3] *Ibid.*, 36 (ii. p. 421).

the Father and the Son.' [1] 'The Holy Ghost is the third Person in the Blessed Trinity,' but third in order only. 'Nor is this order arbitrary or external, but internal and necessary, by virtue of a subordination of the second unto the first, and of the third unto the first and second.' [2] This is supported by a succinct putting of the case by the mathematical and theological mind of Isaac Barrow in his *Defence of the Blessed Trinity*. 'There is,' he states, 'one Divine Nature or Essence, common unto three Persons incomprehensibly united and ineffably distinguished; united in Essential attributes, distinguished by peculiar idioms and relations; All equally infinite in every Divine perfection, Each different from Other in order and manner of subsistence. There is a mutual inexistence of One in All and All in One; a communication without any deprivation or diminution in the Communicant; an eternal generation and an eternal procession without precedence or succession, without proper causality or dependence; a Father imparting His own, and the Son receiving His Father's Life, and a Spirit issuing from Both, without any division, or multiplication of Essence:—these are notions which may well puzzle our reason in conceiving how they agree, but should not stagger our faith in assenting that they are true.' Owen agrees, as he reminds his readers that the doctrine of the Trinity is primarily a Divine revelation in Scripture.[3] 'These Persons are so distinct in Their peculiar subsistence that distinct actings and operations are ascribed unto Them' both without and within the Godhead.[4] 'They which thus know each Other, love each Other, delight in each Other, must needs be distinct, and so are They represented unto our faith.' [5] But the manner of the procession of the Spirit shows that such distinction in no wise detracts from the perfect Unity: for 'as the vital breath of a man hath a continual emanation from him, and yet is never separated utterly from his person or forsaketh him; so doth the Spirit of the Father and the Son proceed from Them by a continual Divine emanation, still abiding one with Them.' [6] Evidence of a

[1] *Exposition of the Creed* (Art. viii), i. § 4. [2] *Ibid.*, § 5.

[3] *A Brief Declaration and Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, p. 32. In Bunyan's *Confession of Faith* (1853 ed., vol. ii) he expresses his belief that the three Persons 'are in Nature, Essence, and Eternity, equally One.'

[4] *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, pp. 64 f. [5] *Vindication*, p. 109.

[6] *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, p. 49. Owen adds that illustrations of finite mysteries must necessarily be incomplete.

Trinity in the Godhead is, according to Beveridge, found in such passages as Gen. i. 26 and Gal. iv. 6 ; and of the Divine Unity in such as Ex. iii. 14 ; Deut. vi. 4 ; and Heb. xi. 6. Like Owen and his other associates, he observes that the mystery of the Trinity 'cannot be proved from reason, but only from Scripture,'[1] and, from a perusal of his *Thesaurus Theologicus*, he appears to build almost all his arguments on a scriptural foundation.

The earnest desire to expound the doctrine of the Trinity more fully, to show its origin in Scripture and maintenance by reason, in face of Unitarian criticism, was the very cause of the controversy to which Sherlock, with all good intentions, gave rise. His own explanation of the doctrine did not appear to every one to be the 'very easy and intelligible notion' that it appeared to himself, and it cannot be wondered at that the Unitarians were indeed amused at Trinitarians failing to agree as to how best to set forth their own beliefs. Early in his *Vindication*, Sherlock lays down that 'the distinction between these three Divine Persons is in the manner of Their subsistence. . . . There is this plain difference between being begotten and proceeding, that though the Holy Spirit have the same Nature with the Father and the Son, yet He represents the Person of neither, as the Son does the Person of the Father.'[2] As, then, the distinctions are real, so 'we must allow the three Persons to be real, substantial Beings, if we allow each Person to be God, unless we will call anything a God which has no real being.'[3] Now it is self-consciousness, he asserts, which makes a finite spirit numerically one, 'and therefore if there were three created spirits so united as to be conscious to each other's thoughts and passions as they are to their own, I cannot see any reason why we might not say that three such persons were numerically one, for they are as much one with each other as every spirit is one with itself.' This, he suggests, at least helps us in a measure to understand the Trinity in Unity.[4] 'And if we can suppose three infinite Minds and Persons thus conscious of whatever is in each Other as They are of Themselves, They can be but one numerical God.'[5] We may therefore refer to the

[1] *Thesaurus Th.*, i. and ii. p. 100.
[2] p. 16.
[3] p. 47.
[4] pp. 48 f.
[5] p. 50. Sherlock expresses a preference for 'one undivided Substance,' in comparison with 'one numerical Substance' : pp. 46 f.

three Persons of the Godhead as 'three distinct infinite Minds,'[1] but not as separate Minds. 'The three Divine Persons of the ever-blessed Trinity are so united to each Other as every man is to himself, not as one man is to another. . . . The Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are One, not by an external agreement or consent, but by an internal consciousness, as every man is one with himself.' This is mutual consciousness,[2] by which each Person, possessing self-consciousness, is united in one Godhead with the Others.[3] Put in this manner, he submits, the doctrine of the Trinity can be more readily grasped. 'The great difficulty of conceiving a Trinity of Persons in one infinite and undivided Essence or Substance arises from those gross and material ideas we have of Essence and Substance. . . . We can frame no idea of Substance but what we have from matter.' For this reason, these old terms encourage the false conception of three Substances in the one God, and accordingly occasion most of the confusion.[4] It would be an improvement on these to use such terms as perfect and eternal Wisdom and Truth as descriptive of the Divine Nature.[5] 'The truth is, we have no positive notion of Infinity, but only in a Mind'—which is why he is using the terms relating thereto. To resume, then; the mutual consciousness which underlies the Triunity of God really emphasizes the Triunity Itself, because only Minds that are infinite can wholly comprehend each Other.[6] 'It is a contradiction to say there are three infinite Minds unless They are mutually conscious to each Other; for if there be anything in One which is not in the Other, They cannot both be infinite.'[7] None of the Three is the one supreme God, but only all Three together.[8] On the other hand, 'the whole Trinity, by a mutual consciousness, is in each Person, and therefore no Person is less than the whole Trinity.'[9] 'The same numerical Essence,' too, though 'whole and entire in each Divine Person,' is so 'in a

1 *Vindication*, pp. 51, 66.

2 *Ibid.*, pp. 55 f. In this connexion he mentions 1 Cor. ii. 10, 11; Rom. viii. 27; John xvi. 14, 15 (p. 65).

3 *Ibid.*, p. 68. An idea latent in Schleiermacher.

4 *Ibid.*, pp. 68 f. Yet he attempts to show later how his views find consistent support in the old terminology of the Early Fathers!

5 *Ibid.*, pp. 70 ff.

6 *Ibid.*, p. 75.

7 *Ibid.* 'The very word "infinite" confounds our notions of God . . . for "infinite" is only a negative term . . . and therefore is nothing' (pp. 78 f.).

8 *Ibid.*, pp. 82, 180 ff. See *The Holy Spirit in the Mediaeval Church*, p. 324.

9 *Ibid.*, p. 83.

different manner,' showing that the three infinite Minds are distinguished from each Other by their mutual relations.[1] But any One of the Persons, regarded as separated from the Others, is not the one, true God. The Persons ' must never be considered in a separate state.' [2] The Introduction to his *Apology for writing against Socinians* shows that during the intervening three years Sherlock had come to appreciate the accustomed terms, such as ' Person,' ' Nature,' and ' Essence,' for he now defends them on the ground that they ' will not suffer heretics to lie concealed under Scripture-phrases.' He reiterates what he had said in the former book concerning the essential oneness of the three eternal Minds, though he does not claim that the mystery of the Trinity is thereby wholly explained and made clear to the finite mind. Both the Divine Trinity and Unity are incomprehensible, yet, he holds, they are proper objects of faith. Then, perhaps not altogether remembering the description of his own ideas in the *Vindication* as a ' very easy ' notion of the Trinity, he declares that it is the heretics who ' make the incomprehensible Nature of God " comprehensible and easy." ' Yet the doctrine of the Trinity is certainly defensible, and must be defended ; ' for run down the Doctrine of the Trinity and Incarnation, and there is an end of the Christian religion, and with that an end of all revealed religion.'

At the commencement of his *Animadversions upon Dr. Sherlock's Book*, South observes that the doctrine of the Trinity, being a Divine mystery, cannot be made as ' plain and easy ' as Sherlock in his *Vindication* supposes, though he says otherwise in his *Apology*.[3] In point of fact, he continues, the accustomed terminology does not perplex men's minds on the subject of the Trinity. It guides the thought while expressing those mysteries where thought cannot follow. ' In the Divine Persons of the Trinity, the Divine Nature and the personal Subsistence coalesce into one by an incomprehensible, ineffable kind of union and conjunction,' and attempts to explain the doctrine by means of human analogies are of little use on account of ' the essential disparity which the mind of man bears to so disproportionate and so transcendent an object.' [4] Sherlock holds that ' self-consciousness makes a

[1] *Vindication*, p. 84.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 87.
[3] Chap. I.
[4] *Ibid.*, chap. II.

person, but mutual consciousness makes a unity, not of persons, but of nature in persons.' But ' self-consciousness in persons *presupposes* their personality, and therefore is not, cannot be, the *reason* of it.' For instance, the human nature of Christ was self-conscious, but was not thereby a person. The soul, too, is self-conscious, but is not a person on that account, whether in or out of the body.[1] Rather is self-consciousness a personal act, which must be *after* the personality of the person whose act it is. The formal reason of everything is *before* everything. Therefore the personal act—in this case, self-consciousness—cannot be the formal reason of personality. It is the *relation* of the Persons to each Other which accounts for Their personality, and for Their designation of ' three eternal Relations.' The fact is that ' self-consciousness can have no constituting influence ' on these interior relations of the Godhead ; for, if self-consciousness constitutes personality, there might just as well be three thousand Persons in the Deity ! Moreover, as against Sherlock's theory of the Divine Unity on the basis of mutual consciousness, South lays down two propositions : (i) No act of knowledge can be the formal reason of a unity of Nature in the Persons of the Blessed Trinity, and (ii) Unity of Nature is the *cause* of Their mutual consciousness, which, in turn, cannot therefore be the cause of Their unity of Nature—even as the self-consciousness of Each cannot be the cause of His personality[2] : for, if the three Persons are mutually conscious of Their mutual in-existence, Their mutual in-existence is necessarily *before* Their mutual consciousness of it.[3] Hence Sherlock's explanation of the Trinity along these lines clearly breaks down. Finally, whereas God is *one* infinite Mind or Spirit, ' three distinct infinite Minds or Spirits are three distinct Gods,' that is, three distinct Substances, which is simply tritheism.[4] Certainly no such views as Sherlock's were held in any shape or form by the Fathers.[5] In his rejoinder Sherlock agrees that Trinitarian analogies ' cannot help us to conceive what kind of union there is between the Divine Persons, the union of matter and spirit differing as much as matter and spirit do.' But this consideration, he submits, hardly affects the points at issue, for questions of

[1] *Animadversions*, chap. iii. [2] *Ibid.*, chap. iv. [3] *Ibid.*, chap. vii.
[4] *Ibid.*, chap. v. [5] *Ibid.*, chaps. vi and vii.

consciousness are not material. The unity of a spirit, he argues, consists in self-consciousness ; in which case a mutual consciousness of three distinct spirits, or three eternal Minds, surely imparts to them a natural oneness. He suggests that the real trouble in the controversy was that ' the names of distinction in ordinary use do not only distinguish but divide and separate their subjects, and the names of unity signify singularity also, which admits no number.' For instance, the word ' person ' in ordinary usage is separate in idea, while in reference to the Persons of the Trinity its idea is simply one of distinction ; but the Socinians have thoughtlessly confused these meanings. Perhaps, after all, ' subsistence,' an old term though it be, may be a better one even than ' mind,' at least in the sense that it does not convey such a semblance of separation. Again, when we come to speak of the Divine Unity, fewer words still are adequate to describe it. To say that the Godhead is one ' single ' Nature is, he says, Sabellianism, the logical inference being that the whole Trinity was incarnated.[1] At the same time, the Divine Unity must be emphasized, in spite of the limitations of terminology. No one Person can rightly be said to be an ' absolute, complete, independent God '—as Sherlock's notion of three eternal, self-conscious Minds at first suggested to South—for the Persons subsist only in ' a relative dependence on each Other.' The Unity of the Divine Persons means, therefore, ' that They have as conscious a sensation of each Other in Themselves as They have of Themselves.' But South was not convinced, and, as noted in the Introduction, the controversy dragged on between Sherlock's followers and South's, who came to be labelled ' Real ' and ' Nominal ' Trinitarians respectively.

The Distinction between Real and Nominal Trinitarians Examined, which was written by one of Sherlock's sympathizers, was an attack on Socinianism more than on South, and also an explanation of what was really at issue between the two Trinitarian parties. According to this anonymous author, Real Trinitarians believed in ' a Trinity of real subsisting Persons,' while Nominal Trinitarians believed in ' only one

1 This would lead to Patripassianism. Yet, putting aside its erroneous Trinitarian teaching, we cannot but perceive an element of truth in it, which is put in Sherlock's way thus, that mutual consciousness entails mutual sensation ; and in Paul's way, that ' God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself ' (2 Cor. v. 19).

real Person, who is God, with a Trinity of Names.' He admits that Sherlock's *Defence* stirred up the Socinians to charge Trinitarians with tritheism, as South had said it would. But he writes: 'The greatest number of the Realists who believe a real Trinity . . . do yet reject those expressions of "Three infinite Minds and Spirits," which are liable to a very heretical sense.' Nevertheless 'the late dispute about "Three Minds" does not in itself divide the contending parties into Realists and Nominals, as the Socinians too hastily conclude,' because the Catholic Fathers 'used "Three Hypostases" in the very same sense.' It is the *sense* of the terms on which the stress must be laid, and when this is done by the Socinians, they will no longer be able to overlook the fact that the Divine Unity is a principal article of faith in the creed of Real and Nominal Trinitarians alike. 'All that the Realists contend for is a real Trinity of true, real, proper Persons; and that, they are certain, cannot be unless each Person by Himself, as distinct from the other Persons, be Substance, Mind, Spirit, Will, Understanding, Power.' For 'to talk of three Divine Persons, who are not subsisting, living, knowing Persons, destroys the only reason for calling Them Persons.'[1] Hence Dr. Sherlock's 'mutual-consciousness theory' of the Divine Triunity, 'after all the noise and clamour about it, seems to be a very sensible representation of the natural In-being of the Divine Persons; and as natural as "self-consciousness" must be acknowledged to be of the unity of a person.' At any rate, 'before the Socinians had charged the faith of the Trinity with tritheism, they should have remembered that the Persons of the Trinity are not three such Persons as their one Person is, whom they call the one God'; for while three Persons in the Trinitarian meaning are equivalent to or denote one God, three Persons in the Unitarian meaning denote three Gods.[2] Both Sherlock and Howe had already pointed this out. Stillingfleet's earnest desire that the discussion between the 'Realists' and the 'Nominalists' should come to a conclusion is seen in his reference to those lazy divines who only say that the Trinity is 'an unconceivable mystery, and that those are as much in fault who go about to explain it, as those who oppose it.'

[1] *The Distinction between Real and Nominal Trinitarians Examined*, chap. ii.
[2] *Ibid.*, chap. v.

At once he declares that Nominal Trinitarians are *not* guilty of Sabellianism, 'because they assert far more than three Names,' as had been suggested: they assert, not mere modes, but the 'Godhead subsisting under such' modes. On the other side, the leader of the Real Trinitarians [Sherlock] was, he says, perfectly orthodox in his belief, though he unwisely went beyond the ancient terminology to explain it. 'We had much better satisfy ourselves with that language which the Church hath received and is expressed in the creeds, than go about by new terms, to raise new ferments, especially at a time when our united forces are most necessary against our common adversaries.'[1] The Catholic position is that the Trinity is a mystery, but decidedly not a contradiction, as the Unitarians supposed.[2] Critics of the doctrine had been comparing the three Divine Persons to three human persons. 'Do they think there is no difference between an infinitely perfect Being, and such finite limited creatures as individuals among men are?[3] . . . All the difference lies, in that a finite nature is capable of division, but an infinite is not.'[4] The Divine Unity, therefore, indicates 'that there cannot be such a difference of individual Substances as there is among mankind.'[5] Only let opponents fully understand the meanings of the terms as used by each other, and the differences between Real and Nominal Trinitarians would soon vanish. Such was the gist of Stillingfleet's unavailing plea.

Meanwhile, Wallis, the Unitarian leader, who had been directing the main attack on both Sherlock and South, did not hesitate to affirm that the Unitarian view was supported by nature, reason, and Scripture. The truth of the Divine Oneness, the first belief of all peoples, is not only sustained by Scripture; it 'is now the general belief even of the pagan and idolatrous nations.' It is the Trinitarians, he asserts, who are the polytheists, in that they 'affirm three Gods, and not one only.' 'These are the words which God spake upon Mount Sinai . . . "I am the Lord thy God; thou shalt have no other God but Me." They [the Trinitarians] tell us His meaning was, There are *three* Almighty, All-knowing, and most good Persons, each of Them, singly and by Himself, God, and

1 Preface to his *Discourse*.
2 *Discourse*, p. 55.
3 *Ibid.*, p. 102.
4 *Ibid.*, p. 109.
5 *Ibid.*, p. 262.

all of Them jointly Creators of all things. Now who would have thought it, that this should be the meaning of " no other God but Me " ? ' Exactly ! Who *would* have thought it ? There was ample need for the plain speaking of the Trinitarians on such a point. Wallis is admittedly on somewhat firmer ground when ridiculing one of the arguments of Bellarmine (whose works are, he says, bulky, and learned, and nothing more !) which runs thus : ' God speaks to the Jews as if He were but one Person, because they, living among people who acknowledged many gods, would have mistaken three Divine Persons to be three Gods.' This is both inverted history and perverted theology. Yet Wallis had obviously been ' mistaken ' in the very way which Bellarmine described. But he does not admit it as a mistake on his own part ; he is simply professing to point out the confusion of Trinitarian belief : and he returns to it in a section of his *Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity* entitled ' The Explication of Dr. J. Wallis.' ' As three angelical persons are three angels, and three human persons are three men ; so three Divine Persons in grammar and common sense are three Gods.' In his own opinion, however, ' a Divine Person is only a mode, a respect, or relation of God to His creatures. He beareth to His creatures these three relations, modes, or respects, that He is their Creator, Redeemer, and their Sanctifier. . . . He hath those three relations to His creatures, and is thereby no more three Gods than He was three Gods to the Jews, because He calleth Himself the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob '—which was said by Trinitarians in the Middle Ages, and ever since. Wallis finally remarks that people are told, as a last resort, that they must regard the Trinity as a mystery, and must therefore believe in it just as they believe in other mysteries which they cannot understand. But no one, he declares, can believe in a mystery which is plainly irrational and absurd. And Scripture references in support of the doctrine of the Trinity are not impressive, he adds, for there is more scriptural warrant for the doctrine of transubstantiation than for that of the Trinity. With regard to this last protest, the only suggestion worthy of notice, namely that the mysterious side of the doctrine was being overemphasized to the discouragement of all explanation, was referred to, as has been

already observed, by Stillingfleet very sympathetically; and the fact that the leading divines of the Church were so eager to explain all that humanly could be explained concerning it, shows that they concurred with Stillingfleet. To assume, however, that the Trinity, on account of its very mysterious side, is 'plainly irrational and absurd' was quite a different matter, and was an assumption at once taken up by Howe. Howe's *Living Temple* was principally devoted to considering aspects of the Divine Unity, but questions relating to the Trinity, some of which he had read in Wallis's book, are more closely examined in his *Calm and Sober Inquiry*. Even if one explanation of a Trinity in God be fallacious, he argues, that would still leave the Unitarians the necessity for proving that a Trinity is impossible on all other explanations; in other words, that the very idea of a Trinity is contradictory. The onus of showing such a contradiction rests on the Unitarians by reason of the ways in which a Divine Trinity is both stated and implied in Scripture. Erase all such Trinitarian teaching from Scripture (and no intelligent critic could do it), and we have left a series of contradictions indeed. Hence only the absolute impossibility of the very idea of a Trinity can warrant its denial; but such absolute impossibility does not appear. We are certainly on surer ground if we determine the meaning of Scripture than if we discuss the possibility of a Trinity, for the former subject is within the reach of the finite mind, the latter not. It is beside the point to dismiss the conception of a Trinity on the ground that one cannot be three, or *vice versa*; it could only be legitimately dismissed if it could be proved that what is one in one sense could never be threefold in another, which is a very different matter. The Schoolmen were not always helpful when they stressed the 'simplicity' of the Godhead as they did. It should clearly be understood that such 'simplicity' can only mean 'union with distinction.' Yet this must convey no idea of 'composition,' 'for the several excellencies that concur in it, being never put together, nor having ever existed apart, but in eternal necessary union . . . import no proper composition, and carry with them more apparent perfection than absolute simplicity can be conceived to do.'[1]

[1] From the excellent summary by Rogers of Howe's book in *The Life and Character of John Howe*, pp. 260 ff.

We cannot understand *how* the three Persons can be One, says Warren, but the truth that They are so, and that They are no mere qualities, has been revealed to us by God. The old analogy of memory, understanding, and will is suggestive of the Oneness of God no less than His Threefoldness. 'There is but one Essence common to all the Three, and therefore, should that fail in the First and Second, it could by no means hold in the Third.' Warren suggests that this mystery might become more intelligible if the Persons were called 'Vitalities,' or 'Eternal Modes of Existence,' diversifying the Divine Essence. But he hesitates to undertake any closely reasoned exposition, feeling that any critical examination of the doctrine of the Trinity amounts to self-exaltation above the reason of God. It is manifest that Matthew Henry was not in sympathy with Sherlock's theory of three Minds, for he defines God as 'an infinite and eternal Mind,' then adds, 'It is easier to say what God is not than what He is.'[1]

Appended Note

In view of the fact that Sherlock, on account of his theory of 'mutual-consciousness,' laid himself open to the charge of tritheism, the exposition of the doctrine of the Trinity given by Dr. W. N. Clarke, in his *Outline of Christian Theology* (1921 ed., pp. 173 ff.), is particularly interesting. Dr. Clarke speaks of the 'self-consciousness' of God as the self-consciousness of one Person, in the *modern* acceptance of the word 'Person.' Accordingly he offers a Trinitarian analogy in which aspects of this one Personality are presented. The 'mental reproduction of the real self,' which adds more perfectly to the self-consciousness the more fully it is reproduced, is likened to the Divine Word; and the recognition of this reproduction, in a conscious unity of spirit, is likened to the Divine Spirit; both the 'reproduction' and the 'recognition' being perfect in the Divine Mind. Such an exposition presupposes one will in God, and thereby avoids the danger which was courted by Sherlock. This is the one God, living in 'eternal and necessary threeness.' That there is a rational necessity for 'threeness' in the Immanent Trinity was taught by Augustine and

[1] *Exposition of the N.T.* (on John iv. 24).

developed throughout the mediaeval period, most attractively of all by the Victorines. This, however, is not to assert that the Incarnation was a rational necessity within the Deity, as one might perchance be led into assuming. The necessity in this case was purely redemptional, as the New Testament clearly shows.

IV

Samuel Clarke's Unitarian propaganda was introduced under cover of so many Trinitarian expressions that it became part of the duty of upholders of the Trinity to expose his actual teaching. 'With the Father and the Son,' he writes, 'there has existed from the beginning a third Divine Person, which is the Spirit of the Father and of the Son'; [1] so that his readers might readily infer the eternity and Divinity of the Holy Spirit. But 'what the proper metaphysical Nature, Essence, or Subsistence of any of these Divine Persons is,' he observes, 'the Scripture has nowhere at all declared; but describes and distinguishes Them always by Their personal characters, offices, powers, and attributes.' [2] This statement as to the silence of Scripture on the subject of the Nature of the Divine Persons is quoted by Edwards with strong disapproval. It is a statement 'which,' he says, 'no man who had looked into the Bible would have had the face to assert, for thence we learn that Their Nature is "spiritual."' [3] Again, 'that They are not three *co-ordinate* Gods, the Doctor has fully proved,' now remarks Gastrell. But, in his desire to preserve the Divine Unity, Clarke postulates but one God, namely the Father, with the logical result that 'the Son and Holy Ghost are only different denominations of the same Being, and not distinct Beings,' which is inconsistent with his own declaration as to Their personal distinctions noted above. The only other possible conclusion, pursues Gastrell, is that the Son and Holy Ghost are not Each fully God, in which case there must be a distinction of nothing less than Being and Nature between Them and the Father. But 'it seems to me that the Doctor himself has taken away all distinction of Being and Nature by allowing every Person in the Trinity to be

[1] *The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, ii. § 3. [2] *Ibid.*, § 4.
[3] *Some Animadversions on Dr. Clarke's Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, chap. iii.

eternal; . . . because whatever is eternal must enter into our notion of God.'[1] Clarke's own inconsistencies, therefore, in Gastrell's opinion, shut him up to the first conclusion that the Father is the only really Divine Person. Gastrell's aim throughout his book is to demonstrate that the Divine Unity can be properly affirmed in Christian theology only by means of an acceptance of the doctrine of the Trinity as universally taught by the Church.

In proceeding against Clarke's associate, the 'Clergyman in the Country,' whose Trinity he describes as 'a great God, a little God, and no God,'[2] Waterland makes a general observation which is not without point. 'The Doctrine of the Trinity,' he says, 'with all its seeming contradictions, has stood the test, not only of what human wit could do by way of dispute, but of all that rage and malice could contrive, through a persecution almost as bitter and virulent as any that had ever been under heathen emperors. This is to me an additional confirmation that the doctrine we profess is no such gross imposition upon the common sense and reason of mankind as is pretended.[3] If only those who raise objections to the doctrine would abide by the ideas and the language of Scripture, they would soon cease to object. As it is, the difficulties which they profess to discover in the doctrine, they themselves have brought to it.[4] Then, in alluding to Clarke's belief which Gastrell had pointed out, he states: 'Three *real* Persons is what I, what every Trinitarian, what all sound Catholics assert,'[5]—which may also be an allusion to the Sherlock-South controversy. 'Here is but one individual infinite Wisdom, which is entirely in the whole, and entirely in every part; proper, in some sense, to each single part (since it can have only such attributes as inhere in it) and yet common to All; diffused through extended Substance, yet not co-extended, nor multiplied, because but One. If you admit thus far, as I think you must, we shall have nothing to apprehend, in point of reason, against the Doctrine of the Trinity.'[6] There is always

[1] *Remarks upon Dr. Clarke's Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity.*
[2] *A Second Vindication of Christ's Divinity*, p. 418.
[3] *First Vindication*, p. 297.
[4] *Second Vindication*, p. 448.
[5] *First Vindication*, p. 20. Waterland remarks that Le Clerc favours Sabellianism (*Ibid.*, p. 63 *n.*).
[6] *Ibid.* (query 9) pp. 172 f.

a vital difference between that which is against reason and that which is above it, and, while seeing nothing in reason against this doctrine, we must admit that the interior relations of the Divine Persons are beyond our comprehension. But that does not warrant a denial of the doctrine. In point of fact, some arguments used in denying the doctrine are frankly atheistic,[1] which is enough to indicate tendencies, and to counsel caution. 'The belief of three Persons, every One singly God, and All together one God,' conveys ideas which are only 'seemingly, not really, repugnant. . . . We believe both, not doubting but that there is a connexion of the ideas, though our faculties reach not up to it.'[2] It may nevertheless help toward right ideas of the Triunity of God to be reminded that 'the Fathers constantly took care to signify that they did not mean that the Persons were *specifically* One, like three human persons, having a separate existence independent of each other.'[3] According to Waterland, Clarke later adopted a certain theory of extension in relation to the Divine Substance which must have been different from Waterland's own theory, previously noticed, as admitting some principle of partition.[4] In his *Second Vindication* Waterland remarks: 'It was once a principle, a maxim with Dr. Clarke, that a Person is a Being, and that two individual Beings cannot be one individual Being. I have heard no more of this since the Doctor has been apprised that his own hypothesis of the Divine Substance being extended could not stand with his famous maxim.'[5] Presumably this means that Clarke's hypothesis of extension really resolved itself into the 'co-extension' or 'multiplication' against which Waterland had already warned his readers, and which could in no wise be reconciled with Clarke's first position that God is simply the one 'individual Being' of the Father. At any rate, almost in the same sentence does Waterland declare that 'the Unity of the Trinity is too strict and close to admit of the name or notion of tritheism,'[6] which 'multiplication' would manifestly imply. It appears, however, that he heard

1 *First Vindication*, query 19. In query 21 he adds that several of these anti-trinitarian arguments are concerned with metaphysical mysteries.

2 *Ibid.*, p. 314. 3 *Ibid.*, p. 382.

4 Clarke is referred to as one 'who, having subjected the Divine Substance to extension, has necessarily introduced "Parts"; there being no extension where there are not "Parts."'—*Second Vindication*, p. 322.

5 p. 64. 6 p. 65.

more of Clarke's original maxim in the course of the following year, for in his *Farther Vindication* there occurs the remark that 'though the union of the three Persons (each Person being Substance) makes Them one Substance, yet the same union does not make Them one Person; because union of Substance is one thing, and unity of Person is another.' [1]

In opening the second stage of the Unitarian Controversy, Priestley follows Clarke in ascribing full Deity to the Father alone, and in regarding Arianism as the correct expression of Primitive Christianity generally. The simple humanity of Jesus was, he affirms, the belief of the Church in its earliest period. This is shown by passages such as Acts ii. 22 ('Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God') and 1 Tim. ii. 5 ('One mediator also between God and men, Himself man, Christ Jesus').[2] Before the Council of Nicaea, the supremacy in the Divine sense was always ascribed to the Father.[3] But, in due course after Nicaea, the doctrine of the Trinity was evolved, so that at the Council of Sardica (A.D. 347) the unity of Substance of both Father and Son was definitely laid down.[4] In this manner, Priestley observes, the doctrine of the Trinity became superimposed as one of the chief 'corruptions' of the Christian faith. The assertion of the Godhead of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit was, in his opinion, 'certainly giving up the unity of the Divine Nature'; so the inconsistency of the 'One in Three' had to be covered over by the term 'mystery,' that is, 'something absolutely incapable of being explained, something that must be believed, though it could not be understood.' Views such as this we find in the fifth-century Athanasian Creed, and onwards; [5] and this deification of the Son and the Spirit was an 'introduction of new objects of worship by Christians' which was not unreasonably ridiculed by the heathen.[6] Augustine's analogy of memory, understanding, and will is regarded as having been 'lame and inadequate,' because 'none of these powers, separately taken, constitute a man.' [7] All Christians, therefore, who do not contend for the Unity of God in the Unitarian sense are

[1] p. 21; also *Ibid.*, p. 40.
[2] *A History of the Corruptions of Christianity*, i. pp. 2 ff.
[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 46 ff.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 54.
[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 86 f., 104.
[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 100 f.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 122.

prevaricators [1] (!). In replying to Priestley, Horsley indulges in sarcasm more than once in reference to the methods adopted by his opponent. Priestley, he says, chooses certain passages of Scripture, reads into them a meaning of his own, neglects those passages which unmistakably prove the Divinity of Christ, and then affirms that the Apostles and their first converts were Unitarians ! [2] Certain remarks of Athanasius concerning the orthodoxy of Dionysius, his predecessor, were alleged by Priestley to reflect upon a Unitarian standpoint as having been adopted by the early Christians in Jerusalem. So Horsley : 'Athanasius nowhere, I confess, denies that the primitive Church of Jerusalem was Unitarian. Nor, on the other hand, do I recollect that Dr. Priestley hath asserted it in any part of his *History of Electricity* ! The truth is, that in either of these valuable works the faith of the primitive Church never comes in question.' [3] Similarly, if Epiphanius 'makes no mention' of the Nazarenes as believing in the Divinity of Christ, neither does he mention them as disbelieving in it ; while he certainly does assert as the truth His Incarnation, and the part taken by the Holy Ghost in connexion therewith.[4] The evidence available points the other way, that is, not the way suggested by Priestley : and, in any case, the Nazarenes were not Jewish Christians, as Priestley states, but a Jewish sect.[5] Again, Priestley cannot contend in reason that the Unitarian doctrine is 'the clear sense of Scripture, which,' he tells him, 'according to the scheme of interpretation which you follow, hath no clear sense at all.' In point of fact, 'the Unitarians themselves pretend not that their doctrine is to be found in the plain literal sense of Holy Writ ; on the contrary, they take the greatest pains to explain away the literal meaning. They pretend that the sacred writers delight in certain metaphors and images, which, however unnatural and obscure they may seem at this day, are supposed to have been of the genius of the Eastern languages, and of consequence familiar to the first Christians. . . . By the help of these supposed metaphors, the Unitarian expositors contrive

1 *A History of the Corruptions of Christianity*, p. 151.
2 *Tracts in Controversy with Dr. Priestley* (*A Charge to the Clergy*), p. 15.
3 *Ibid.* (*Tracts*), pp. 23 f.
4 *Ibid.*, pp. 28 ff.
5 *Ibid.*, pp. 31 ff. Also *Letters* vi and vii (pp. 139 ff.).

to purge the Scripture of everything which they disapprove.'[1] Moreover, Priestley is in no better case when he labours to show that Unitarianism was the clear belief of the Early Church.[2] The facts are against him on both counts. Horsley admits that it is only natural that the Doctrine of the Trinity, since it concerns the Being of the Infinite, should present the finite mind with difficulties. 'It should seem,' he says, 'that to involve difficulties must be one characteristic of a Divine revelation.'[3] But there are more difficulties still, attaching to the Unitarian belief.[4] Such a reference to the Trinity as is found in Acts ii. 33 is just one of many which cannot be gainsaid. Here, for instance, 'the three Persons are distinctly mentioned in a manner which implies the Divinity of Each,' while 'the whole difference lies in personal distinctions, not in essential qualities.'[5] This latter observation surely shows how unmistakably the Doctrine of the Trinity emphasizes the Unity of God, and does so as the Unitarian doctrine cannot. 'Our knowledge of the personal distinctions is so obscure, in comparison with our apprehension of the general attributes of the Godhead, that it should seem that the Divinity is rather to be generally worshipped in the three Persons jointly and indifferently, than that any distinct honours are to be offered to Each separately.'[6] 'I maintain,' adds Horsley, 'that the three Persons are one Being . . . so strictly One, that any individual thing in the whole world of matter and of spirit presents but a faint shadow of Their Unity.'[7] The defenders of the Trinitarian faith were careful to affirm, as against both Clarke and Priestley, the highest ideals of Divine Oneness as being not only fully maintained, but actually emphasized, by the Doctrine of the Trinity.

1 *Tracts in Controversy with Dr. Priestley* (*Letters*), p. 114. In his *Remarks upon the Second Letters* (*ibid.*, pp. 386 ff.), Horsley considers Priestley's judgement that 1 John v. 7 (A.V.) is an interpolation deliberately made by the 'orthodox.' He denies this on the ground that (i) many of the orthodox, himself included, do not believe that this text relates to the consubstantiality of the three Divine Persons, and (ii) the proof of its being an interpolation at all is not clear. 'The omission of it breaks the connexion, and wonderfully heightens the obscurity of the Apostle's discourse.'

2 *Letters*, viii–xi.

3 'Butler's *Analogy* cured me of the folly of looking for nothing mysterious in the true sense of a Divine revelation.'—*Tracts* (*Letters*), p. 315.

4 *Ibid.*, pp. 279 ff.

5 *Ibid.*, p. 231.

6 *Ibid.*, p. 234.

7 *Ibid.*, pp. 295 f.

V

Francis Bacon's exaltation of reason, side by side with his hesitation to take too much for granted in the theological sphere, finds expression in the low estimate which he places on certain Trinitarian analogies drawn from nature. 'The pagan idea that the world is not the work, but the image, of God, has betrayed us into the error of making inferences from the formation of the world as to the Being of God.'[1] As to the Divine Being Himself, however, he is quite ready to accept the orthodox doctrine of the Church. 'I believe,' he declares, 'that God, as He is eternally almighty, only wise, only good, in His Nature, so He is eternally Father, Son, and Spirit, in Persons.'[2] Hobbes is not so completely in accord with the Nicene Creed as he would have us believe. His view of the Trinity as set forth by Erdmann is that 'just as God revealed Himself in Moses as one Person, in Christ as a second Person, He also revealed Himself in the Holy Ghost, i.e. the Apostles and their successors, as a third Person.' But Erdmann is careful to add that *Persona* is used by Hobbes in its dramatic sense, meaning thereby 'successive' rather than 'eternal' distinctions.[3] The three 'real' Persons, believed in—according to Waterland—by every sound Catholic, could not possibly be construed into a Trinity of *dramatis personae*. The fact that the Trinity is an ineffable mystery does not prevent a defence of the doctrine being undertaken by Leibnitz, who frankly recognizes the place of revelation in any complete scheme of knowledge. But he is none too clear as to how any revelation of Eternal Truth could be expressed in the Holy Spirit as well as in the Son; accordingly, as observed by Peip,[4] he does not construct the Trinity 'beyond a dyadic development.'

Under the general head of Mysticism, the beliefs of Quakerism first attract attention in reference to the doctrine of the Trinity. Criticisms of the doctrine on the part of William Penn are not reflected in the Quaker movement in Britain, for Penn was constantly on the personal defensive, and thus was placed at a disadvantage for the purpose of calm and impartial exposition. The work of Barclay supports the principal

[1] *De dignitate et augmentis scientiarum*, iii. Erdmann, *History of Philosophy*, i. p. 671.
[2] *Confession of Faith.* [3] *Hist. of Phil.*, i. p. 720. [4] Herzog, *Encycl.*

statements of the doctrine on the orthodox side, but mainly by statement itself. In his *Catechism* he adheres to the affirmation contained in 1 John v. 7 (A.V.),[1] while there is a short reference, of scriptural wording, in his *Apology*,[2] but that is all. The variations from the ' accepted ' form of the doctrine found in British and Continental philosophy receive an addition in the writings of Swedenborg, which, in some small degree, is reminiscent of the opinion of Hobbes. Swedenborg expressed the belief that, at the end of the Jewish dispensation, God assumed human nature in Jesus Christ, and that the effluence from Christ was the Holy Spirit. Remembering his emphasis on the essential unity of all things, and on the correlation of the physical and the spiritual, we can see how he arrived at the conclusion that God is not three Persons, but one Person appearing in a trinity of varying revelations all of which are perceivable in Christ as spirit, body, and power. His doctrine of the Divine Unity thus does not at all admit of the Divine Trinity as generally taught by the Church. God is one God in the same sense as a man is one man. Apropos of this, there is an interesting passage in his *Heaven and Hell* in which he declares that he has often conversed with angels on the subject of the Unity of God, ' and,' he states, ' they have always said that they cannot in heaven distinguish the Divine Being into Three, because they know and perceive that the Divine Being is One, and is One in the Lord. They said also that members of the Church who come from the world entertaining the idea of three Divine Persons cannot be admitted into heaven, because their thought wanders from one Person to another ; and that it is not allowable there to think of Three and speak of One, because in heaven every one speaks from his thought.' Instant discovery and rejection await all ' who in the world have divided the Divine Being into Three, and have entertained a separate idea of Each.' Swedenborg really does not do the angels justice in regard to their knowledge of Christian theology ! He himself, however, can explain this so-called division of the Divine Being only by the thought that it must have been the reality of Christ's humanity which seemed to necessitate some distinction between Christ and God. It is the teaching of Swedenborg on behalf of which the claim

[1] Chap. i. [2] Prop. 2.

is made that it ascribes a higher position to Christ than does any 'orthodox' Christian creed, in that it lays down the Oneness of the *Personality* of Father and Son. The Oneness of Their *Substance*, however, surely ascribes to Christ a position equally high, while allowing for a certain distinction between Father and Son which is by no means the individualizing distinction understood in human phraseology. Swedenborg's system is Sabellian to a degree. That noted forerunner of Pietism, Jakob Boehme, is much nearer the orthodox position, in spite of the extraordinary character of much of his interpretation. In Boehme's teaching, God reveals Himself as Father, as Son—more nearly to human comprehension, and as Holy Spirit—the uncaused will of God through the Son.[1] At the appearance of the Divine Spirit God becomes knowable as Love, Its Expression, and Its Visible Variety, by a timeless, immanent process.[2] Such a Trinity is the outcome of an immanent evolution within God, into the mysteries of which Boehme claims to have been partly initiated. The Essence of God thus revealed as threefold has passed into the natural universe, and so from the human side has provided us with many similitudes of the Trinity, such as those which are given in the *Aurora*. Especially is it held to be true that, since man is made in the image of God, what is found in man is an indication of what may be found in God;[3] as, for instance, self-consciousness becoming its own object, and then returning to itself. Thus, 'above the circle or inclosure which we behold with our eyes, and which we call heaven, does appear the totally triumphing Holy Trinity, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. . . . God the Holy Ghost is the third Person in the triumphing Holy Deity, and proceeds from the Father and the Son, and is the holy moving Spring or Fountain of joy in the whole Father.' The 'whole Father' is a curious term, but intelligible in Boehme's system, in which the Father is the first revelation of the Divine Nature, or knowable *alteritas* ('otherness'), the Fountain of Love Itself.[4] 'Now,' he continues, 'when we speak or write of the three Persons in the Deity, you must not conceive that therefore there are three

1 See Erdmann, *Hist. of Phil.*, i. p. 582.
2 See *Encycl. Brit.*, art. 'Boehme.'
3 See Erdmann, *ibid.*, pp. 580, 590.
4 'The Father is the original Essence of all Essences.'—*Three Principles*, § 4.

Gods, Each reigning and ruling by Himself, like temporal kings on the earth. No: such a Substance and Being is not in God; for the Divine Being consists in power and not in body or flesh.' The eternal Father, the Son as 'the Father's Heart or Light' eternally generated by Him within the Godhead, and the Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from Them Both, constitute the Trinity.[1] The Oneness of God or of the Divine Essence, which Boehme stresses here, is in accord with his philosophy of the 'Ungrund,' of God as the original Unity, and is asserted again in his *Three Principles of the Divine Essence.* Till the commencement of the seventeenth century no such fresh presentation of the doctrine of the Trinity had been made, as was made by Boehme in his symbolic Mysticism, ever since the time of the Scholastic Mystics, when Richard of St. Victor wrote his *De Trinitate* and based his idea of the Trinity on the essentials of Love.[2] This doctrine received little treatment from the Pietists, still less from the Moravians. Bengel, in the course of the scanty attention which he gives to it, followed Boehme in his insistence on the Divine Unity. In commenting on 1 John v. 7 (A.V.) and 8 in his *Gnomon,* he writes: 'Nothing can separate the Spirit from the Father and the Son; for if the Spirit were not one with the Father and the Son we should have to say that, in conjunction with the Father and the Son—who are One, the Spirit makes Two. . . . But they are One (*unum*) in Essence, knowledge, will.'

It need hardly be added that, on the subject of the Absolute Trinity, Methodist teaching was entirely in line with doctrinal development in the Western Church. 'The Methodists believe concerning God and His attributes, that there is one God. . . . They believe further, that in the Unity of the Godhead there are three Persons, of one Substance, power, and eternal existence, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost.'[3] Wesley's references to the Redemptional Trinity, particularly his emphasis on the manifold work of the Holy Spirit, are founded on the doctrine of the Trinity as generally set forth; and were all the more forceful because of his constant insistence on

[1] *Aurora,* § 3.

[2] See *The Holy Spirit in the Mediaeval Church,* pp. 131 ff.

[3] Jonathan Crowther, *History of the Wesleyan Methodists* (1815). Crowther puts up a defence for the authenticity of 1 John v. 7 (A.V.).

the perfect unity of the Divine Persons. On the face of it, it would seem incredible that the overwhelming testimony of centuries of great Christian thinking to the truth of this doctrine should now prove to have been mistaken. To the leader of the Evangelical Revival, however, this doctrine was above all a long-tested embodiment of *practical* truth, first revealed in Scripture for the salvation of mankind; and it is this realization which, throughout the history of the Christian Church, has most fully met the deepest needs of the human soul. With this in view, we may repeat the words: 'No man having drunk old wine desireth new: for he saith, The old is better.'

IV

THE PLACE OF THE SPIRIT IN THE REDEMPTIVE TRINITY

'Pater nos adoptavit per Filium, et per Spiritum sanctum nos inhabitantem.'—WOLFGANG CAPITO.

IV

THE PLACE OF THE SPIRIT IN THE REDEMPTIVE TRINITY

I

In passing from the consideration of the Absolute or Immanent Trinity to that of the Relative or Economical Trinity we may be well advised to remember that the latter, though first in regard to the order of human perception, is simply the former as revealed in this dispensation for the purpose of the salvation of the race. There is no warrant for alleging so considerable a distinction between the two as, for instance, Dr. Gardner does, when he states that 'an absolute Deity, as opposed to a relative Deity, that is to a Deity in constant relation to man and nature, is necessarily outside the range of thought and human intelligence.'[1] In the Christian sense no such 'opposition' of the subjects can exist, for they are essentially related in human thought. It is too sweeping an assertion, therefore, that the modern mind can regard the doctrine of the Trinity '*only* as an expression of relative truth, an attempt to enclose in human formulae the results of the spiritual life and the actual experience of the Church.'[2] While the Trinity is reflected in actual experience, it is another matter to suggest that the whole of the doctrine relating to It must emanate from a subjective source. On the other hand, those who experience the saving and sanctifying fellowship of the Divine Persons are enabled to understand more of the mystery of the Trinity than are those who are content to be mere metaphysicians, and this doctrine as a relative truth undoubtedly requires separate discussion as centring upon man.

The doctrine of the Trinity in its redemptional aspect was the form in which it principally appealed to the Reformers. It was a rediscovery which enabled them, after the long

[1] Percy Gardner, *The Practical Basis of Christian Belief*, p. 129.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 172.

centuries of scholastic treatment, to combine the testimonies of internal and external revelation, and to combine them with greater effect than the Mystics had been capable of doing. Harnack has pointed out that, to Luther, 'Father, Son, and Spirit are not three Persons existing side by side, but one God and Father has opened His Fatherly heart to us in Christ, and reveals Christ in our hearts by His Spirit'[1]: that is, God in redemptive action was the subject of his especial attention. Similarly does Arminius express the belief that, while the doctrine of the Trinity is a mystery in so far as it relates to the interior association of the three Divine Persons, it is no mystery redemptionally or 'economically,' since contemplation of it, as the mode of salvation whereby the Father and the Son work through the Spirit, produces spiritual fruits.[2] Limborch notes the stir which the dogma of the Trinity, in the absolute sense, has aroused in the Christian world, and feels himself on safest ground when producing evidence of a Trinity from references in Scripture;[3] while Cameron, though disagreeing with much of the teaching of the Arminian school, refers to the Divine Triunity in the middle of an evangelical sermon based on John vi. 56, relating the subjects of the Trinity and salvation to each other according to revealed truth.

Representatives of English Protestantism in the early part of this period gave considerable attention to the Trinity of Redemption as revealed in the New Testament, partly because the more 'academic' discussions relating to the Absolute Trinity had not yet been resumed in earnest, partly because the majority of the English theologians of the time were noted just as much for their preaching as for their writing. In dwelling upon the scene at the Baptism of Jesus, Andrewes sees the whole Trinity present;[4] and, in speaking of the Divine supply of grace to mankind, he quaintly describes the distinct function of each Person in the Deity—'the Father, the Fountain; the Son, the Cistern; the Holy Ghost, the Conduit-pipe.'[5] In the opinion of Cartwright also, the Lord's Baptism clearly reveals

[1] *Hist. of Dogma* (E. tr.), vii. § 4.
[2] *Thesis VI, de Sp. sanct.*, § 3.
[3] *Theol. Chr.*, ii. 17 (intro.).
[4] *Sermon* 8 *on the Holy Spirit* (Lk. iii. 21 f.; May 29, 1615).
[5] *Sermon* 14 *on the Holy Spirit* (James i. 16 f.; May 20, 1621).

the Trinity,[1] and the baptismal formula (Matt. xxviii. 19) affords 'the clearest evidence' of the same fact. Suggestions of a Trinity are found in the Old Testament, says Donne, but 'the manifestation of the mystery of the Trinity was reserved for Christ';[2] and it is only in the Scriptures that definite teaching concerning this mystery can be truly found.[3] 'There are,' remarks Donne again, 'two processions of the Holy Ghost, *eterna* and *temporaria*, His proceeding from the Father and the Son, and His proceeding into us. The first we shall never understand, if we read all the books of the world. The other we shall not choose but understand, if we study our own consciences.'[4] Arminius had said practically the same. But doubts have been cast on the evidence for the doctrine of the Trinity referred to above as presented by the baptismal formula at the end of St. Matthew's Gospel. This, it has been claimed,[5] must be an anachronism, since such a formula is not reported as being used at baptisms recorded in the Acts. An answer to this objection comes from the pen of John Lightfoot. Commenting on Acts ii. 38 ('Be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ'), he writes: 'Not that their baptism was not administered in the name of the Father and the Holy Ghost also; but that He [the Holy Ghost] would specially work them up to the acknowledgment of Christ. For the Father and the Holy Ghost they acknowledged without any scrupling, but to own Christ for God, whom they had crucified, and to be initiated into Jesus of Nazareth, was the great work that the Apostles went about to work upon them, and therefore especially endeavour to enter them into Jesus, and to have them baptized in His name.'[6]

When, a little later, the Socinian attack on the doctrine developed a new intensity, valuable answers were made not only by theologians of the Church who reasoned in more expected ways, but also by those who emphasized the close connexion between the Trinity and the deeper needs of the

1 Hic etiam luculentum testimonium habetur Trinitatis personarum; Patris scilicet loquentis, Spiritus requiescentis super Filium, et Filii stantis.—*Harmonia Evangelica* (on Matt. iii. 13–17).

2 *Sermon* 28 (John xiv. 26).

3 *Sermon* 30 (John xiv. 20).

4 *Sermon* 32 (1 Cor. xii. 3).

5 As, for instance, by Dr. Percy Gardner, *The Practical Basis of Christian Belief*.

6 *Commentary on Acts*.

human heart. Such an answer would be expected from so great an experimental teacher as Bunyan. In his *Saved by Grace* he unites the three Divine Persons in the work of salvation in no uncertain manner. 'We are saved by the grace of God,' he writes; 'and since we find in the Word that in the Godhead there are Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, we must conclude that it is by the grace of the Father, Son, and Spirit that we are saved. Wherefore grace is attributed to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost distinctly.' He puts this truth again still more pointedly: 'Some think that the love of the Father and blood of the Son will do, without the holiness of the Spirit of God, but they are deceived. . . . There is a [third] sort that think the holiness of the Spirit is sufficient of itself; but they (if they had it) are deceived also; for it must be the grace of the Father, the grace of the Son, and the grace of the Spirit, jointly, that must save them.' Owen, having in mind those who insisted that the Spirit is simply the 'influence' of the Others, echoes Bunyan's caution against regarding the Father and the Son as 'enough,' without the Person of the Spirit: for the only conclusion from so mistaken a view is that 'men may pray without Him, and preach without Him, and turn to God without Him, and perform all their duties without Him well enough.'[1] But even Christ could not do such a thing, as the presence of the Spirit along with the Father at His Baptism clearly shows;—so suggests Beveridge.[2] In propounding his mutual-consciousness theory of the Divine Triunity, Sherlock was as anxious to found his statements on Scripture as any of his predecessors had been. The perfect union which exists between the three Infinite Minds appears in such passages as John i. 18; iii. 25; and x. 30, 38; while that between Them as specially concerning the Holy Spirit is referred to in John xvi. 13–15; Rom. v. 5; and 1 Cor. ii. 10.[3] On the other hand, the emphasis which Sherlock laid on the 'reality' of each Divine Person is carried on by that anonymous sympathizer of his who wrote *The Distinction between Real and Nominal Trinitarians Examined*. 'Though,' he writes, 'the works of creation did not visibly distinguish the Divine Persons,

[1] *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, p. 33.
[2] *Thesaurus Theologicus*, i. (*Articles of the Christian Faith*).
[3] *A Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, pp. 52 ff.

yet the work of redemption does; Father, Son, and Holy Ghost have Their distinct parts and offices in this glorious work.'[1] The last three quotations cited from Sherlock serve also to illustrate this. The doctrine of the Trinity, therefore, as Stillingfleet points out, stands or falls with the authority of the Gospels,[2] and if the Unitarians were to abide by the witness of Scripture they would indulge in less general talk about the unreasonableness of the doctrine itself.[3] That Stillingfleet regards the Baptismal Confession (Matt. xxviii. 19) as strong evidence for the doctrine is shown by the fact that he devotes the whole of the ninth chapter of his book to emphasizing the Trinity on the basis of this alone, especially to demonstrating that the Ante-Nicene Fathers regarded the passage in the same light. For '(i) those who took [these terms] in another sense were opposed and condemned by the Christian Church; (ii) the Christian Church did own this sense in public acts of divine worship as well as private; and (iii) it was owned and defended by those who appeared for the Christian faith against infidels.'[4]

II

Insistence on scriptural testimony was not overlooked by Waterland in the course of his replies to Clarke and his followers, though neither he nor Horsley touched to any extent on the redemptive aspect of the Trinity. A comment of Waterland's on Romans xi. 36 ('of Him, and through Him, and unto Him') is to the effect that the verse is best understood of three Persons in the Deity, the prepositions appearing 'in express contra-distinction to each other.'[5] But even if this exegesis be faulty, Waterland was by no means alone among the theologians of the earlier years of the eighteenth century in regarding the doctrine as having an experimental as well as a metaphysical side. To the Deists, who sorely needed to learn such a lesson,

1 Chap. v.

2 *A Discourse in Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, pp. 27, 112.

3 *Ibid.*, pp. 6 ff.

4 *Ibid.*, p. 182. Matthew Henry (*Exposition of the N.T.*, on Luke iii. 22) notes the presence of the Trinity in the scene of Christ's Baptism.

5 Sanday and Headlam discourage any Trinitarian interpretation of this text on the ground that '(1) the prepositions do not suit this interpretation . . . εἰς αὐτόν cannot naturally or even possibly be used of the Spirit. (2) The whole argument refers to a different line of thought. It is the relation of the Godhead as a whole to the universe and to created things.' (*Com. on Romans*, 5th ed., p. 340.)

Bishop Butler writes: 'The obligation we are under, of paying these religious regards to Each of these Divine Persons respectively, arises from the respective relations which They Each stand in to us.'[1] The presence of Deity, therefore, can be seen not only in the mode in which the Persons are related to each Other, but also by the manner in which They are related to individual members of the human race, Each exercising His own especial function in the redemptive process. Similarly, when Bengel seeks to show from 1 John v. 7 and 8 (A.V.) that 'these Three are One (*unum*),' he refers to the allusion 'Those bearing witness' as appropriately suiting Persons, and argues the Divinity and Personality of Each, in order, on the strength of Their unique spiritual work. 'The Spirit,' he observes, 'even as it is declared, was bearing witness before the water and the blood, even without the water and the blood; but the water and the blood never testify without the Spirit.'[2] In the latter half of the same century particularly, John Wesley constantly, indeed almost exclusively, thought of the Trinity as God in action for the salvation of man, and therefore of this work of the Triune God as reflecting upon the Triunity Itself. For instance, the doctrine of the Witness of the Spirit means to the believer that 'God the Holy Ghost witnesses that God the Father has accepted him through the merits of God the Son; and, having this witness, he honours the Son and the blessed Spirit "even as he honours the Father." . . . Therefore,' Wesley concludes, 'I do not see how it is possible for any to have vital religion who denies that these Three are One.'[3] In arriving at this conclusion, he refers approvingly, in this same sermon *On the Trinity*, to Swift's sermon on the same subject—one of the best he ever wrote, says he—in which he shows that those who have endeavoured to explain it have not only utterly lost their way but also have, above all other persons, hurt the cause which they intended to promote. 'It was in an evil hour,' remarks Wesley, 'that these explainers began their fruitless work. I insist upon no explication at all; no, not even on the best I ever saw; I mean, that which is

[1] *Analogy*, ii. 1.

[2] Bengel notes other passages as indicating a Trinity in the Deity, such as Matt. iii. 16 f.; xxviii. 19; Luke i. 15; iv. 18; John iii. 11; iv. 23; v. 32; Rom. viii. 9; ix. 4; Eph. iii. 6; Heb. i. 1; vi. 4; x. 29; and 1 Pet. i. 2.

[3] *Sermon* lx (1 John v. 7, A.V.), 1775.

given us in the Creed commonly ascribed to Athanasius. . . . I would insist only on the direct words, unexplained, just as they lie in the text.'[1] The mystery of the Trinity lies, he holds, not in the fact, but in the manner of it, and *this* we are not called upon to understand. Therefore, 'would it not be absurd in me to deny the fact, because I do not understand the manner? That is to reject what God has revealed, because I do not comprehend what He has not revealed.' Wesley's object, as he then proceeds to show, is to demonstrate that 'the knowledge of the Three-One God is interwoven with all true Christian faith, with all vital religion,' and accordingly he stresses the redemptive relations of the Divine Persons in the allusion to the Witness of the Spirit already noticed. 'It is universally allowed,' so he says in another place,[2] 'that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost dwell in all believers.' His outlook was always intensely practical, and, consequently, when regarding the doctrine of the Trinity, he almost invariably does so from the experimental standpoint.

Dr. W. N. Clarke states that 'the Trinity of manifestation rendered it certain that the conclusion concerning the Spirit would be the same as concerning the Son. . . . Christ and the Holy Spirit, related as They are in the Christian revelation, cannot be essentially unlike, one grounded in God's eternal mode of being, and the other not.'[3] Only in so far, therefore, as the distinct redemptive operations of the three Divine Persons are experienced, can the doctrine of the Trinity have practical and lasting value. This is not necessarily to assert that experience can distinguish the Persons by these distinct operations. Such a view would be inclined both to press distinction into separation, and to suppose a source of human knowledge within, which is not entirely dependent on Divine

1 Wesley remarks that Bengel once doubted whether this text (1 John v. 7, A.V.) was genuine. 'But his doubts were removed by three considerations: (1) That though it is wanting in many copies, yet it is found in more; and those copies of the greatest authority. (2) That it is cited by a whole train of ancient writers, from the time of St. John to that of Constantine. This argument is conclusive; for they could not have cited it, had it not then been in the Sacred Canon. (3) That we can easily account for its being, after that time, wanting in many copies, when we remember that Constantine's successor was a zealous Arian, who used every means to promote his bad cause, to spread Arianism throughout the empire; in particular, the erasing this text out of as many copies as fell into his hands.'

2 *Notes on N.T.* (John xvi. 13).

3 *Outline of Christian Theology*, p. 168.

revelation from without.[1] But since revelation has afforded us a vision of the Triune Nature of the 'all-redeeming God,' this redemptive aspect of the doctrine should be more emphasized, in order that thereby the doctrine itself may more readily be related to life as well as to thought.

[1] The feelings of finite minds are totally inadequate judges of the existence of certain eternal distinctions in the Infinite Mind to which such feelings may be related. See W. N. Clarke, *Outline of Christian Theology*, p. 379.

V

THE PROCESSION OF THE SPIRIT

'Spiritus sanctus hoc habet proprium, quod ex Patre et Filio aequaliter procedit; et est amborum Spiritus, eiusdemque substantiae et aeternitatis cum Patre et Filio.'—ALCUIN.

V

THE PROCESSION OF THE SPIRIT

I

The division between the Churches of East and West on the matter of the Procession of the Spirit was as marked as ever at the close of the mediaeval period. Western theology had regarded the implications of Scripture and the demonstrations of reason as fully supporting belief in the equal and simultaneous procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son as from one Source,[1] and it increasingly emphasized the closest connexion between the Spirit and the Son as being vital to the progress of Christianity itself. The attitude of the East continued firm in its antagonism to such sentiments as unwarranted by any declarations of the New Testament and as tending toward Sabellianism. So, in *The Orthodox Confession of the Eastern Church*, 1643, the Father is referred to as the Source (*ἀρχή*) and the Origin (*ῥίζα*) of the Son and the Holy Spirit (Q. vii). Baptism into the threefold Name (Matt. xxviii. 19) indicates the truth of the three Persons (*πρόσωπα*) in the one Godhead, the Third proceeding solely from the First (Q. ix).[2] The Greeks upheld their own view of the Procession as avoiding the avowal of two active principles in the Godhead, and also as avoiding the 'Sabellian subterfuge' of the Latins in their combining of the two principles into one. Such, at any rate, was the Greek outlook. Even the phrase 'from the Father, through the Son' was regarded as being more applicable to the economical Trinity than the transcendental, and therefore as pertaining more to the Spirit's Mission than to His Procession.[3] As might be expected, the official denials of the *Filioque* were supported by the individual

1 See *The Holy Spirit in the Mediaeval Church*, pp. 324 ff.; and Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*, p. 370.

2 Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἀπ' αἰῶνος ἐκπορευόμενον ἐκ Πατρὸς, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ υἱῷ.

3 See Gavin, *Greek Orthodox Thought*, pp. 128, 132; and later in the book for certain promising considerations towards mutual understanding between East and West.

publications of the time, as, for instance, Zoernikau's *Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father only* (1682).[1]

That closest connexion between the Spirit and the Son referred to above is stressed by the first Western authority of our period, the *Formula of Concord*: 'Since Christ in respect of His Deity is the second Person of the Holy Trinity, from Him, as also from the Father, the Holy Spirit proceeds; thus the Spirit is both His and the Father's, and remains for ever inseparable from the Son of God.' Similarly, Arminius asserts that, since the Holy Spirit 'proceeds from the Father and is sent by the Son, therefore He is a Spirit proceeding from Both,'[2] His followers, however, are as notable for their disbelief in the *Filioque* as they are for their theory of subordination among the Persons. In the course of his *Institutiones Theologicae*, Episcopius expresses grave doubt as to the truth of the twofold procession.[3] Though, he says, the Spirit is called the Spirit of the Son, it is from the Father that He proceeds. 'It is not equally certain and clear from Scripture that it is so distinctly affirmed that the Holy Spirit proceeds and emanates from the Son, as it is distinctly affirmed that He proceeds from the Father; since Scripture expressly asserts the latter, not the former: still less that it is so distinctly asserted that the Spirit proceeds from the Son and the Father by precisely one and the same spiration. For while it is not right to conclude that, since the Holy Spirit is spoken of in Scripture as emanating or proceeding from the Father, therefore He does not emanate or proceed from the Son; yet there is no proof for the conclusion (*tamen etiam non colligitur ἀποδεικνικῶς*) that, since the Holy Spirit is called the Spirit of the Son, and is sent and bestowed by the Son, therefore, by precisely one and the same spiration, He emanates and proceeds simultaneously from the Father and the Son: because the Holy Spirit can be called the Spirit of the Son, and can

1 Other Eastern writers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are enumerated by Gavin, *Greek Orthodox Thought* (Bibliography, p. xxxi).

2 *Thesis VI, de Sp. sanct.*, § 3.

3 Samuel Horsley (*Charge to the Clergy*) touches on the Subordinationism of Episcopius in the remark that he, 'though himself no Socinian, very indiscreetly concurred with the Socinians of his time, in maintaining that the opinion of the mere humanity of Christ had prevailed very generally in the first ages.' This reveals a reason for his disbelief in the *Filioque* closely akin to one of the reasons given by the Greeks, namely that the Holy Spirit could not proceed from the humanity of Christ (!). See *H. Sp. in Med. Ch.*, p. 327.

be bestowed and sent by the Son, not by reason of His emanation or procession from the Son by nature, but by reason of His manifestation in time.'[1] Episcopius follows on with three *consectaria* or conclusions:

(1) 'That, in short, it is not necessary for salvation, as affecting knowledge and belief, that the Holy Spirit proceed from the Father and the Son, much less that He proceed by one and the same spiration from Them Both, as from one and the same Source; so then, those who either call it in question, or deny it, cannot be styled heretics. For it is neither expressly asserted in Scripture, nor from the Scriptures are the necessary consequences deduced. . . .

(2) That it is sufficient for salvation if it be believed, with steadfast but simple faith, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, and that He is also the Spirit of the Son; since both these stand out clearly and prominently in Scripture. . . .

(3) That the Greek Church has abundant cause for its divergence from the Latin Church on the ground that *Filioque* was added to the creeds of Nicaea and Constantinople without its consent. Hence the entire blame remains at the door of the Latin Church.'[2]

Grotius, who of all the better-known disciples of Arminius remained closest to the views of his master, emphasizes in his *Annotations on Romans* the dogma of the Procession as taught in the West, holding that the very fact that the Holy Spirit is called the Spirit of Christ strongly suggests His procession from the Son also. Curcellaeus, however, reiterates the observation of Episcopius to the effect that there is a significant lack of definite statement in Scripture expressly affirming such a twofold procession.[3] 'I was,' he writes, 'baptized in infancy in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and, as an adult, I have openly confessed, with the whole Christian Church, that I believe in one God the Father Almighty . . . and in His only-begotten Son . . . and in the Holy Spirit who proceeds from the Father and is sent by the Son.'[4] Further than that, that is, in the direction of a procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son also, he has not ad-

1 'Cum Spiritus sanctus Filii Spiritus dici possit, et a Filio dari ac mitti, non ratione naturalis emanationis aut processionis a Filio, sed ratione temporalis manifestationis.'

2 *Inst. Theol.*, iv. ii. § 36.

3 *Institutio Religionis Christianae*, ii. § 19.

4 *Prima Dissertatio Theologica*, § 4.

vanced, because he feels that he cannot bring himself to believe in an idea which is contained merely in tradition and not expressly in Scripture.[1] Limborch, true to the main drift of Arminian thought before him, makes no assertion of the truth of the *Filioque* either in Book II or Book VI of his *Theologia Christiana*, where he most discusses the subject of the Trinity. Le Clerc, however, resumes the more negative attitude to the Western view which characterized Episcopius and Curcellaeus. In his pamphlet on Samuel Clarke, he writes: 'The Scripture always speaks of God in such a manner as to establish a perfect Unity in the Eternal Essence that created all, without ever saying or affirming that from this Essence there proceeded, from all eternity, two other Essences, the one of which is called "the Son," and the other "the Holy Spirit." This is an idea that seems only to have been introduced by the terms that were invented in after times to explain a thing that is above our comprehension and conception, and about which they had done much wiser and better to have still kept close to the phrases and expressions of Scripture, and never departed from the language and style of the Apostles.' This is characteristic of that insistence on the letter of Scripture which was a marked feature of the Arminian movement since Episcopius. But it is surprising to see a professor of ecclesiastical history state that Trinitarian theology postulated a procession of the Son and the Holy Spirit as 'two other *Essences*' from the Essence of God, which is certainly departing 'from the language and style' of those writers referred to. The favour with which the Arminians regarded the Greek distinction between the temporal procession of the Spirit from the Son, and any metaphysical procession of the former from the latter, is quite clear from such an observation. But what is not so clear is, how such an indiscretion could have improved an already doubtful contribution to the controversy concerning Clarke.[2]

1 *Prima Dissertatio Theologica*, § 38.

2 French Protestant theology and Roman Catholic theology united in their belief in the equal procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son. Cameron's sermon on John vi. 53 ff. emphasizes the fact of the Spirit's being the Spirit *of Christ*. But, writes Amyraut, 'by what manner the Spirit proceeds equally from the Father and the Son by way of the motion of will is altogether incomprehensible (*omnino ἀκατάληπτον*).'—*De Mysterio Trinitatis*, iii. In the seventh Book of his *De Trinitate* Petavius follows Bellarmine's example in discussing the history of the *Filioque* since the time of Theodoret—a piece of work which Gibbon (*Rome*, vi. p. 523 *n.*) regards as nonsense!

II

The testimony of English Protestant writers in the first half of the seventeenth century, both Anglican and Puritan, to the truth of the Western view of the Procession was based in the main on Scriptural foundations. Andrewes cannot help but believe in the Spirit's procession from the Son after carefully studying such passages as John xiv. 26; and xv. 26.[1] Within the Divine Unity the Spirit is fully God, yet distinct, and He proceeds by the mystery of spiration from both the Father and the Son.[2] Then the bestowment of the Holy Spirit on the disciples by Christ after His resurrection manifestly demonstrates the truth of the twofold procession. It is, he adds, 'enough to clear the point.'[3] Consideration of Christ's Baptism in the Jordan (Matt. iii. 13–17) impels Cartwright, in his *Harmonia Evangelica*, to refer to Christ as the One 'from whom the Spirit, just as from the Father, proceeds, and whose He is, just as He is the Father's.' On John xiv. 12–19, he comments: 'It is observed against the Greek Church that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, since the Son Himself is not only the mediator of the sanctification of the faithful, but He Himself sanctifies them.[4] And since this cannot take place except through the Spirit, it follows that the Spirit proceeds from the Son just as from the Father, seeing that the Son Himself works no less through the Holy Spirit than does the Father.' This means that Christ is present with His people through His Spirit in a fuller way than ever He could be if the Spirit did not proceed from Him. Finally, Cartwright lingers on John xv. 26 ['The Comforter . . . whom I will send unto you from the Father,' &c.]. 'From this,' he says, 'the Greeks gather that the Spirit does not proceed from the Son, because He is spoken of as proceeding from the Father; though they will not deny that the Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son. But, in the first place, it must be understood that here the statement is made not in reference to eternal, but to temporal procession. In the second place, too, the fact that He is said to be sent by the

1 *Sermon* 3 *on the H. Sp.*
2 *Sermon* 5 *on the H. Sp.* (Whit-Sunday, 1612).
3 *Sermon* 9 *on the H. Sp.* (John xx. 22; May 19, 1616).
4 Evidently in reference to Eph. v. 26; and Heb. xiii. 12.

Son is the same as to proceed from the Son. . . . Lastly, with the exception of opposite relations, all that is said of one Person is said also of the Others. Since, therefore, active spiration is not opposed to filiation, but only to passive spiration, which is applicable to the Spirit; it follows that it is applicable equally to the Son and to the Father. Then, if the Spirit were not to proceed from the Son, He would not be distinguished from Him personally; for opposite relations alone cause personal distinction within the Godhead.' There is a familiar ring in this argument concerning 'opposite relations' which is reminiscent of certain discussions in the mediaeval period. The procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son was embodied as a belief in the *Westminster Confession* (ii. § 3), but it was Chillingworth's opinion that such belief is no more necessary unto salvation than the belief in purgatory.[1]

The denials of the twofold procession on the part of the later Arminians, founded on the absence of any express declaration on the point in the New Testament, continued to meet with refutations in England when more serious measures had to be taken in defence of Trinitarian doctrine. Bishop Pearson insists that the Holy Spirit is 'a Person proceeding from the Father *and* the Son,' and continues: 'Though it be not expressly spoken in the Scripture that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Son, yet the substance of the same truth is *virtually* contained there; because those very expressions which are spoken of the Holy Spirit in relation to the Father, are also spoken of the same Spirit in relation to the Son (John xv. 26; Rom. viii. 9).'[2] Owen feels the same, and declares, as did Cartwright, that 'if the Spirit did proceed only from the Person of the Father, He could not be promised, sent, or given by the Son.'[3] The testimony of Scripture is perfectly clear, observes Beveridge, for passages such as John xvi. 14, and Gal. iv. 6, should leave no doubt on the subject. But he insists that reason supports Scripture testimony in confirming the Spirit's procession from the Son. 'The Spirit,' he argues, 'proceeds not from the Father as He is a Father, but as God; but the Son is the same God with the Father': therefore the

[1] *Religion of Protestants*, iv. 34.
[2] *Exposition of the Creed* (*Art. VIII*), i. § 6.
[3] *Vindication*, p. 107; *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, p. 56.

Spirit must proceed also from the Son, as the Latin, and certain of the Greek, Fathers allow.[1] This very argument is reflected in John xv. 26 : ' The Father is the fountain of the Deity. He communicates His whole Essence to the Son. The Father and the Son communicate the same to the Holy Spirit.' [2] This is the argument by implication.

Throughout the remaining Trinitarian and Unitarian discussions the question of the procession of the Spirit did not arise for debate as it had arisen in the case of the Arminians and the Greeks. Indeed, Sherlock is of the opinion that too much had been made of differences which, in the very nature of things, could never finally be resolved into unity. The inquiry as to whether the Spirit should be said to proceed ' by ' or ' from ' the Son is, he believes, one of such nicety, particularly as ' we understand not the manner of this procession of the Holy Spirit, as ought to have made no dispute, much less a schism, between the two Churches.' [3] He commends, however, the good intentions of the Latin Church in adding *Filioque* to the Creed, because the desire was evidently to maintain the subordination of the Spirit to the Son.[4] It is doubtful whether such a desire loomed as large in the minds of those who made that addition as Sherlock supposed, though it is clear that one great effect of the *Filioque* was to maintain the Deity of the Son against the Arian party, and Sherlock would not miss a point like this in debating with the Socinians. It need hardly be added that his idea of subordination had no relationship to that of the later Arminians, as his mutual consciousness theory of the Divine Triunity shows. This theory is still uppermost in his mind when he touches on the question of the Procession. The Holy Spirit, he declares, ' proceeds both from Father and Son ; for this Divine Love eternally proceeds from God's reflex knowledge of Himself, or seeing Himself in His own Image : He loves Himself in His Image, and therefore the Spirit proceeds from Father and Son, that is, from the Original and the Image, by one undivided act ; as every man

1 Instancing Ambrose, Augustine, Hilary, and Epiphanius.

2 *Thesaurus Theologicus*, i.

3 The suggestion, however, that the schism, or the whole division, between East and West can be put down to the *Filioque* is not warranted by the facts. See *H. Sp. in Med. Church*, pp. 48–54.

4 *Vindication*, p. 17.

loves himself in that idea and image he has formed of himself in his own mind.'[1] Thus, while generation is a reflex act, procession is a direct act.[2] The definitions of South follow a more accustomed line, but are no less unmistakable in support of the twofold procession. Spiration, he says, is the act 'by which the Father and the Son together eternally breathe forth the Holy Spirit,' while procession is that 'by which the Holy Spirit proceeds, and receives His Divine Nature jointly from Them Both.'[3] With this exposition Warren shows cordial agreement. 'The Holy Ghost,' so he writes in his *Essay on the Trinity*, 'has His vitality from both the Father and the Son, and therefore the Father does not only own Him for His Spirit (Rom. viii. 11), but also declares Him the Spirit of His Son (Gal. iv. 6).'

The reasonableness of the Western view appealed to Boehme's mystical mind, and, in affirming the procession of 'the third self-subsisting Person in the Deity' from the Others, he indulges in a characteristic simile: 'As the elements in this world go forth from the sun and stars, and are the moving spirit which is in everything in this world, so the Holy Ghost is the moving Spirit in the whole Father,[4] and proceeds or goes forth from eternity to eternity continually from the Father and the Son.'[5] So notable a New Testament scholar as Bengel is equally convinced of the truth of the twofold procession, and defends it as the inevitable outcome of scriptural statements. Referring in his *Gnomon* to John xv. 26, he remarks that the Spirit of God is the same as the Spirit of Christ (Rom. viii. 9; Gal. iv. 6). 'Each is implied here, for as the Son is said to send the Paraclete, the Father not being excluded; so the Spirit of Truth is said to proceed from the Father, the Son not being excluded.' Wesley makes a similar comment on the same verse in his *Notes on the New Testament*: 'That the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son as well as from the Father may be fairly argued from His being called the "Spirit of Christ" (1 Peter i. 11), and from His being here said to be sent by Christ from the Father, as well as sent by the Father in His name.'

The real question at issue between those who asserted the

[1] *Vindication*, p. 135. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 258. [3] *Animadversions*, chap. viii.
[4] The whole 'original Essence of all essences.'
[5] *Aurora*, § 3. So also in *The Three Principles of the Divine Essence*, § 4.

procession from the Son as well as from the Father and those who denied it, was not so much one of saving faith as one of practical progress in vital religion in the case both of the individual and of the Church. This would seem to be not an unfair judgement of the situation and its effects. For those who reasoned from Scripture that the Holy Spirit must proceed from the Son also, bore in mind, more than did their opponents, the great fact of the ever-present Christ and therefore the urgent necessity of emphasizing the essential relation of the Spirit as the Spirit of the Son. To them the *Filioque*, which expressed this truth of the presence of Jesus by His Spirit, completely met the need, without involving any unscriptural denial of the Spirit's Divine 'personality.' In the words of Dr. W. L. Walker, the Holy Spirit is 'the distinctive and abiding reality in Christianity' because He is '*distinctively* that Spirit as it comes to us from the whole life and teaching, work and personality of Jesus Christ for our salvation.'[1] The Spirit comes to us from God, and where is God revealed as He is revealed in Jesus Christ? Moreover, 'Christ is the complete expression of the Holy Spirit's life in man.'[2] Hence the significance of the *Filioque* cannot be confined to merely academic discussion. It is itself inwrought into the Divine plan of salvation.

[1] *The Spirit and the Incarnation*, p. 90. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 158.

VI

THE PERSONAL LIFE OF THE SPIRIT

'No one can be holy in the New Testament sense without the Holy Spirit. . . . It is the experimental proof of the personality and divinity of the Spirit. It is on the ground of this absolute dependence of the divine life in our souls upon Him, that we say the Spirit is to be worshipped and glorified with the Father and the Son.'—JAMES DENNEY.

VI

THE PERSONAL LIFE OF THE SPIRIT

I

THE Mediaeval Church gave long and careful attention to some of the very doubts as to the personal life of the Holy Spirit which appear to fill the minds of certain modern thinkers. No other conclusion seemed legitimate, in face of what had been revealed in the New Testament and growingly formulated by the Ancient Church, than that there are within the Godhead three relations eternally distinguished from each other, namely Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, numbered together and mutually equal, and in no sense derogating from the absolute Oneness of God. It was clear, therefore, that the word 'person' as attributed to the infinite and perfect Being must be understood in a different way from that in which it is understood in its popular usage. Accordingly mediaeval theologians took pains to arrive at a definition of Divine personality which would best meet the necessities of the case. They realized that in the sphere of the infinite the materialistic conceptions so generally associated with the finite could not enter: human numeration, for instance, must be excluded, since personality, in the Divine meaning particularly, 'does not permit of definite boundaries.'[1] Whether, therefore, we see Aquinas speaking of it as 'an indivisible substance of rational nature,' or Melanchthon as 'an indivisible, intelligent, and incommunicable substance,' or Durandus as 'that which is subject to mental intention' (*res intentioni subjecta*), we see honest attempts made in this direction. General agreement was reached that triunity is not the same as triplicity: in the Deity two Persons are not together greater than one, nor three than two, for All are in Each. In addition to the difference between this and the

[1] See E. S. Waterhouse, *Philosophy of Religious Experience*, p. 254. In *The Spirit, God and His Relation to Man* (ed. B. H. Streeter), p. 164, Mr. C. W. Emmet makes reference to Mr. J. L. Paton's definition of 'personality' as 'capacity for fellowship,' which may not unsuccessfully stand the test of scrutiny when applied to the Holy Spirit as described in the New Testament.

popular conception of 'person,' there is a difference between it and the modern philosophical conception. '"Person" nowadays,' observes Dr. Gavin,[1] 'has come to signify "a self-conscious and self-directing being," but does not connote, as it did to the Fathers, a special mode of the existence of such a being,' and therefore an 'eternal and permanent' mode of the existence of God. Accordingly he suggests that it is advisable to use the term 'hypostasis' for 'person' in any discussion of Greek theology. It is just as advisable to maintain this second distinction in the discussion of Western theology, the terminology of which closely resembles *in content* that of the East where this idea is concerned.

The Greek term occurs here and there in Arminian treatment of the subject. Arminius himself refers to the Holy Spirit as a single distinctive character—'the hypostatic power which is in God.'[2] 'The Holy Spirit,' he states, 'is a Person in the holy and indivisible Trinity, subsisting as the third in order, who proceeds from the Father and is sent by the Son. . . . As to hypostasis (*secundum hypostasin*) He is distinct from Both.'[3] 'It is true,' writes Episcopius, 'that in Scripture these Three are not expressly called, but yet are clearly represented as, ὑποστάσεις (*hypostases*) . . . and correctly spoken of as Persons.' He quotes at length from Scripture with reference to each Person, then adds: 'From these facts I conclude that not only is there no real reason (*gravem causam*) why we should shrink from the term "Persons," and "Three Persons," but also a good reason why we should employ the term "Persons."'[4] With this Limborch shows complete agreement: 'These Three, of whom Scripture makes mention as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are described for us in Scripture as an indivisible Subsistence, possessing life, intelligence, will, and power; . . . wherefore it has been the common custom of theologians to call Them three Persons.'[5] They are united in one Subsistence on account of Their being perfect Persons of a Divine order, eternal modes of the Perfect Being. In this sense, no less is each of the Persons a Subsistence. That the Holy Spirit is such may be seen in such passages as 1 John v.

[1] *Greek Orthodox Thought*, pp. 122 f.
[2] *Thesis VI, de Sp. sanct.*, § 2.
[3] *Ibid.*, § 3.
[4] *Institutiones Theologicae*, lib. iv. sect. ii. § 32.
[5] *Theologia Christiana*, ii. 17, § 4.

7 (A.V.), and Matt. xxviii. 19 ; ' and,' adds Limborch, ' many other things which are here and there attributed to the Holy Spirit in Scripture are applicable to nothing save to a subsistent Person.' [1] The Roman Catholic theologian Petavius shows that such a conclusion receives the support of the Fathers.[2]

In upholding the personality of the Holy Spirit as taught by the Church, English divines subjected the testimony of Scripture to as severe an examination as ever had the Arminians. In the course of Andrewes's *Sermons on the Holy Spirit* the subject is more assumed and referred to as true than carefully expounded. The first of these sermons contains an allusion to ' the third Person in the Trinity,' and the third points to the significance of the use of the personal pronoun in John xiv. 26 (' *whom* the Father will send in My name '), and in John xv. 26 (' *whom* I will send unto you from the Father '). That other great preacher, John Donne, is still more explicit. He declares that the Holy Spirit is more than ' Nature ' or ' Providence ' : He is a Person. Many ' say it is the working of God, and not God working.' But depersonalize the Holy Spirit, and, in practice, both Father and Son cannot have such a place as They should in the soul's experience. At least, protests Donne, ' this is the Person without whom there is no Father, no Son of God, to me.' [3] Referring to the Spirit's coming to convict the world of sin (John xvi. 8), Peter Sterry says : ' It appears to be a *Person* of whom our Saviour speaks, by those demonstrative particles—" He," " Him." It appears to be some great one, a Divine Person, by those works which are to be done by Him : to comfort hearts, to convince a world, to be instead of Christ ; nay, to be a better Comforter than Christ Himself in the flesh. . . . The Blessed Spirit is not only " the Power of the Godhead," but " a Person in the Godhead." For Christ speaks of Him as a Person, and as of a distinct Person in the Trinity (John xiv. 16), " Another Comforter " : another besides Jesus Christ.[4] . . . The Father's love-token to man is His own Son. The Son's love-token to His spouse is His own Spirit.[5] . . . Jesus speaks of the Spirit to His Apostles,

1 *Theologia Christiana*, ii. 17, § 6. 2 *De Trinitate*, ii.
3 *Sermon* 31 (Gen. i. 2 ; Whit-Sunday, 1629).
4 *Sermon on ' The Spirit's Conviction of Sin,'* pp. 2 f. (Cp. *H. Sp. in Med. Ch.*, p. 330.) 5 *Ibid.*, pp. 3 f.

" You shall know Him " (John xiv. 17). These Two are distinct Persons in respect of Their appearances as well as subsistences.[1] . . . Christ came into our flesh. The Spirit comes into our hearts (John xiv. 16).'[2] It is recognized by so sane an expositor as John Lightfoot that the term ' Holy Ghost ' as found in the Scriptures does not always denote the Person of the Holy Ghost, or the third Person in the Trinity, since ' it is a Rabbinic expression, very common in the writings of the Jews ; . . . and evermore in their use and sense meaneth only the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit.'[3] This, it need hardly be observed, was written with the Old Testament especially in view, and in no wise reflects upon the belief in the Person of the Holy Spirit which Lightfoot manifestly held. The clear intention, however, of these English Protestant preachers was to impress upon their hearers and readers the necessity of applying to themselves inwardly the truths embodied in the orthodox teaching. So Richard Baxter : ' Each Person in the Trinity is so believed in by Christians as that, in Baptism, they enter distinctly into covenant with Them ; which is, to accept the mercies of, and perform the duties to, each Person distinctly. . . . So,' he affirms, ' to believe in the Holy Ghost is to take Him for Christ's Agent or Advocate with our souls, and for our Guide, Sanctifier, and Comforter, and not only to believe that He is the third Person in the Trinity.'[4]

II

In the first stage of the Trinitarian Controversy, John Biddle and his Socinian retainers more than met their match in the famous expositor of the Creed. Commenting on *Article VIII*, Pearson writes (i. §1) : 'Our first assertion is, That the Holy Ghost, described to us in the Word of God, and joined with the Father and the Son in the form of Baptism, is a Person. . . . That Blessed Spirit is not only an energy or operation, not a quality or power, but a spiritual and intellectual subsistence. . . . It seemeth to me,' he continues, ' strangely unreasonable that men should be so earnest in endeavouring to prove that

[1] *Sermon on the ' Spirit's Conviction of Sin,'* p. 4.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 5. [3] *Commentary on Acts.*
[4] *Christian Directory* (pt. i. on *Christian Ethics*), iii. § 3.

the Holy Ghost which sanctifieth them is no substance, when they cannot be assured that there is anything operative in the world beside substantial beings.' The Socinians might have regarded this as begging the question, for, in accordance with the gist of Crell's *De Uno Deo Patre*, the operative substantial Being would be God the Father; but Pearson's point is that the testimony of Scripture definitely attributes the work of sanctification to the Holy Spirit. 'But,' he resumes, 'we are not left to guess at the nature of the Spirit of God; the Word of God which came from that Spirit hath sufficiently delivered Him as a Person. It is indeed to be observed that in the Scriptures there are some things spoken of the Holy Ghost which are proper and peculiar to a person. . . . Whereas, if ever anything be attributed to the Holy Ghost as to a person, which cannot be otherwise understood of the Spirit of God than as of a person, then may we infallibly conclude that the Holy Ghost is a Person.' On the supreme importance of scriptural evidence Pearson is emphatic. 'Again,' he proceeds, 'the New Testament doth describe the Holy Ghost by such personal dispositions, and with such operations, as are evident marks and signs of a person as any which are attributed to the Father or the Son, which are unquestionable Persons.' Rom. viii. 26; 2 Cor. iii. 15–17; Eph. iv. 30 are among the passages quoted in support. Grief, speech, and hearing are personal operations 'of which a quality is not capable,' and these operations are 'attributed to the Spirit in such a manner as they cannot be ascribed to God the Father'; so that, while there is 'equality of personality,' there is 'distinction of personality' within the Godhead. Further, 'the Holy Ghost is said to come unto the Apostles as sent by the Father and the Son; and to come as so sent is a personal action, which we have already showed cannot be the action of the Father, who sent the Spirit; and it is as certain that it cannot be the action of an Apostle, who was affected with the Spirit which was sent.' It must also be observed that the fact that the same term Paraclete (*Παράκλητος*) is used in respect of both Christ and the Holy Ghost, points to the personality of the latter. 'When it relates to the Holy Ghost,' Pearson remarks, 'we translate it always "Comforter"; when to Christ, we render it "Advocate": of which diversity there can be no reason, because Christ, who is a Paraclete, said

that He would send another Paraclete (John xiv. 16); and therefore the notion must be the same in both.'[1] In the face, then, of the testimony of the New Testament, the evasions of Socinianism cannot 'evacuate or enervate the doctrine of His proper and peculiar personality.'

It may perhaps be noticed that Bunyan is not always particular as to whether he uses the personal or the impersonal pronoun in reference to the Holy Spirit, but it must be remembered that he wrote for the populace in a sense in which the theologians of the schools, and, in fact, certain of the preachers of the Establishment, never did, nor, for that matter, would probably have brought themselves to do had they been able. At the same time, a perusal of his works can surely leave no doubt whatever that he fully believes in the personal energies of the Holy Spirit in human life generally, and particularly in the spiritual experiences of the soul. But it is to Owen that we have to turn for a more complete refutation of Socinian error with regard to the Being of the Spirit of God. In his *Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, in which he also remembers the subordination theory of Arminianism, he postulates that 'the Holy Spirit is an eternally Divine existing Substance, the Author of Divine operations, and the Object of Divine and religious worship.' Strong indications of the Spirit's personality in this high sense are found in both Old[2] and New[3] Testaments. Our belief as touching the Deity and Personality of the Spirit rests on a scriptural basis. 'He is an intelligent, voluntary, Divine Agent,' and, if the frequent repetition in Scripture of statements that point to this 'are not sufficient to evince an intelligent Agent, a personal Subsistence that hath being, life, and will, we must confess that the Scripture was written on purpose to lead us into mistakes and misapprehensions.'[4] So then, 'the Holy Ghost is a Divine distinct Person, and neither

[1] 'This Philonic term has been translated "Comforter" unfortunately. The disciples returned to Jerusalem with great joy *before* the Paraclete was given.'—Dean Inge at Cambridge, 1911. See also Beet, *Manual of Theology*, pp. 109 f.; and Hare, *Mission of the Comforter*, p. 309, Note K.

[2] p. 90. Quotations given: Gen. i. 2; Job. xxvi. 13; xxxiii. 4; Pss. xxxiii. 6; civ. 30; cxxxix. 7.

[3] pp. 90–92. Quotations given: Matt. xii. 31; xxviii. 19; Lk. xii. 12; John xiv. 26; Acts i. 16; v. 3; xiii. 3 f.; xx. 28; xxviii. 25 f.; 1 Cor. iii. 16; xii. 11; 2 Cor. xiii. 14; 2 Pet. i. 21. 'St. Paul does not identify the Spirit with the ascended Christ.'—Gore, *The Holy Spirit and the Church*, p. 114.

[4] pp. 92 f., 95. Reference is made to 1 John v. 7 (A.V.), and 1 Cor. xii. 3–6.

merely the power or virtue of God, nor any created spirit whatever. This plainly appears from what is revealed concerning Him. For He who is placed in the same series or order with other Divine Persons, without the least note of difference or distinction from Them as to an interest in personality, who hath the names proper to a Divine Person only, and is frequently and directly called by them; who also hath personal properties, and is the voluntary Author of personal Divine operations, and the proper Object of Divine worship, He is a distinct Divine Person.'[1] This argument is reiterated with emphasis. 'To join a "quality,"' he says, 'with acknowledged Persons [as in Matt. xxviii. 19], and that in such things and cases as wherein They are proposed under a personal consideration, is a strange kind of mystery.' On the contrary, the Holy Spirit has 'the names proper to a Divine Person (John xvi. 17; Acts v. 3 f., 9),' also personal properties, such as will (1 Cor. xii. 11) and understanding (1 Cor. ii. 10); and 'He is the voluntary Author of Divine operations,' and the Recipient of worship as is Each of the other Persons.[2] As the Author of Divine operations, 'He regenerateth, enlighteneth, sanctifieth, comforteth, instructeth, leadeth, guideth all the disciples of Christ, as the Scriptures everywhere testify. Now all these are *personal* operations, and cannot with any pretence of sobriety or consistency with reason be constantly and uniformly assigned unto a quality or virtue.'[3] While such statements as that the Holy Spirit is 'given,' or 'sent,' do not prove Him to be God—'nor did ever any produce them to that purpose—yet they undeniably prove Him to be a Person. . . . For how can the power of God, or a quality as they (Socinians) speak, be said to be "sent"?' On the other hand, 'the communications, distributions, divisions of the Spirit, which they (Socinians) mention' in order to discredit His personality, 'denote only works, gifts, operations, and effects of the Spirit, the rule whereof is expressed, 1 Cor. xii. 7.'[4] And throughout these discussions of the Spirit's personality it is necessary to bear in mind that no *separate* personality, such as that implied by the individuality of a human person, is meant by the term. 'A Divine Person is nothing but the Divine Essence

[1] *Vindication*, pp. 94 f. [2] pp. 95–100. Several Scripture passages are repeated.
[3] p. 99. [4] pp. 103 f.

upon the account of an especial property, subsisting in an especial manner.' [1]

Owen's better-known work, *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, is just as firmly grounded on Scripture. Here he declares that ' the Holy Spirit . . . is not only called πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ, " the Spirit of God," but πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, " the Spirit that is of God," which proceedeth from Him as a distinct Person.' [2] Owen recognizes the close relation which exists between the Spirit of God and the regenerated spirit of man, but issues a warning against being led to identify the two. ' The Spirit of God,' he writes, ' may not be said to be the spirit of this or that man who hath received of His gifts and graces. David prays, " Take not Thy Holy Spirit from me " ; not " my Holy Spirit." And He is distinguished from our spirits even as they are sanctified by Him (Rom. viii. 16).' [3] Moreover, many of the reasons given for there being a Trinity in the Godhead would militate against any such identification.[4] Accordingly it must be concluded that ' this Spirit . . . is in Himself a distinct, living, powerful, intelligent, Divine Person ; for none other can be the author of those internal and external Divine acts and operations which are ascribed unto Him.' [5] Such is ' the constant uniform tenor of the Scripture.' [6]

III

The controversy associated with Sherlock helped to concentrate attention on the meaning of the term ' person ' as applied to the Deity, partly in connexion with the continued campaign against the Socinians, but more so in connexion with the argument which arose with South. In the first place, Sherlock devotes a portion of his *Vindication* to meeting an old objection on the part of the Socinians, which shows confusion between the significance of Divine and human personality. Their difficulty was, that the statement of Trinitarians that

[1] *Vindication*, p. 112. [2] p. 55. [3] p. 57. See *H. Sp. in Med. Ch.*, p. 329.
[4] pp. 80 f. [5] pp. 65, 67.
[6] pp. 68 ff. Owen further instances the Baptismal Formula (p. 71), and the descent of the Spirit on Christ in the form of a dove, showing that He has a subsistence of His own (pp. 74 ff.). He adds that this was no real dove, but merely some ethereal substance in that shape (cf. *H. Sp. in Med. Ch.*, p. 338). The Holy Spirit is also the object of personal actions (pp. 78 ff.). George Bull argues personality from procession (*Defensio Fidei Nicenae*).

three Persons are one God is the same as saying that three human persons are one man. The answer is that three men are three 'divided and separate,' which is certainly not intended of the tripersonal Life of God.[1] On the other hand, a real distinction exists between the Divine Persons, Each possessing self-consciousness. 'A Person is an intelligent Being, and to say, They are three Divine Persons and not three distinct infinite Minds, is both heresy and nonsense. . . . When we prove the Holy Ghost to be a Person—against the Socinians, who make Him only a Divine power—we prove that all the properties of a person belong to Him, such as understanding, will, affections, and actions.'[2] 'It is ridiculous to conclude that the Holy Ghost, who has personal acts ascribed to Him, to work miracles, to raise the dead, to comfort, to convince, to sanctify the Church, to dwell in the Church, &c., is yet no Person.' And 'to prove that the Holy Ghost is no Person, only because personal acts are sometimes figuratively attributed to that which is no person [e.g. Charity], is a maxim only in the Socinian logic.'[3]

In his reply to Sherlock, South offers his own definition of 'person' as a rational being (*suppositum rationale*), possessing the faculty of perceiving and reasoning (*ratio intellectiva*).[4] As he understands it, Sherlock's position is that self-consciousness constitutes personality, whether in respect of God or of man. His own view, however, is that self-consciousness *presupposes* personality, and therefore cannot be its cause ;[5]

1 *Vindication*, p. 47. 2 pp. 66 f.

3 p. 190. Wallis, the Socinian leader, regarded the term 'Divine Person' as signifying a mode, a respect, or a relation of God to His creatures ; but his belief on the subject was none too clear. Sherlock, in his later *Apology for writing against Socinians*, remarks : 'Dr. Wallis would not undertake to say what a Divine Person signifies, as distinguished from Nature and Essence, and only says, a Person is "somewhat" ; but the true notion of a Person he does not know.'

4 *Animadversions*, chap. ii.

5 There is a striking parallel to this in Bishop Butler's dissertation *Of Personal Identity* : 'One should really think it self-evident, that consciousness of personal identity presupposes, and therefore cannot constitute, personal identity ; any more than knowledge, in any other case, can constitute truth, which it presupposes. This wonderful mistake may possibly have arisen from hence, that to be endued with consciousness is inseparable from the idea of a person, or intelligent being. For this might be expressed inaccurately thus—that consciousness makes personality : and from hence it might be concluded to make personal identity. But though present consciousness of what we at present do and feel, is necessary to our being the persons we now are ; yet present consciousness of past actions or feelings is not *necessary* to our being the same persons who performed those actions, or had those feelings. . . . Remembering or forgetting can make no alteration in the truth of past matter of fact.'

so that Sherlock, in deriving Divine Personality from self-consciousness, and making the Divine Unity to depend on the mutual consciousness of three 'Minds,' has arrived at a result akin to tritheism. Wrong premises led him to a wrong conclusion. It is safer, South declares, to abide by the well-tried terminology, and to say that 'the Holy Ghost subsists personally by that act of procession by which He proceeds from, and relates to, both the Father and the Son.'[1] This was the line taken by Bishop Bull, and it avoids the tendency towards tritheism. Thus, resumes South, 'the Divine Persons are three Relatives, or one simple Being, or Essence, under three distinct relations, and consequently differ from one another, not wholly and by all that is in Them, but only by some certain mode or respect peculiar to Each, and upon that account causing Their distinction.'[2] Or we may say: *Opposite* relations constitute the distinct Persons, 'that maxim of the schools being most true, that *sola oppositio multiplicat in Divinis*[3] . . . We do not say that a Person is only a *modus* (mode), but that it is the Divine Nature or Godhead subsisting under such a *modus*; so that the Godhead is still included in it, joined to it, and distinguished by it.'[4] Sherlock's reply in his *Defence* concedes but little ground to South, as has been seen in Chapter III. He is indignant at any suggestion of tritheism being attached to his opinions. A Trinity of modes, and a Trinity of eternal Minds are, he holds, the only possible alternatives; for self-consciousness *is* the cause of personality whatever South may say. By this, however, he does not mean that the Divine Persons are to be considered as mutually independent. On the contrary, They subsist only in relative dependence, for the three eternal 'Minds' are three 'Relatives,' as, of Divine necessity, They must be. South's rejoinder shows that he was equally unconvinced by his opponent.

The points made on the general subject of the Trinity by the anonymous author of *The Distinction between Real and Nominal Trinitarians Examined* have already been discussed in earlier chapters, as also have those made by Stillingfleet in his eirenicon. On the question of the personality of the Spirit distinctly, or as distinctly as may be possible, the former

[1] *Animadversions*, chap. iv. [2] *Ibid.*, chap. v.
[3] 'Opposite relationship alone causes plurality within the Godhead.'
[4] *Ibid.*, chap. viii.

insists against the Socinians that the Holy Spirit is 'not an immanent Act' in God, but a Person.[1] He warns his readers that, while the Unitarian conception of 'Person' reads into 'three Persons' three Gods, the Trinitarian conception does nothing of the kind, for it does not admit of individualist or separatist ideas. Properly understood, each Divine Person 'has the whole of the Divine Nature perfectly in Himself,' yet not 'incommunicably in Himself';[2] so that, while each Person is therefore more than a Divine mode, He shares in a perfect unity of Life which All communicate to Each. In spite of his bias toward the side headed by Sherlock, this writer assumes quite a fair attitude to both, and Stillingfleet could follow on without difficulty. 'A person,' he states, 'is a complete intelligent substance, with a peculiar manner of subsistence.' This 'peculiar manner' is, he feels, incommunicable—as far as a general human definition goes;[3] but that he does not press it in applying it to the inner Life of God is clear from his constant emphasis on the enormous difference in the two conceptions of the one term, while yet he mentions it in order that the reality of the personal distinction should not be obscured. 'The proper reason of personality,' then, 'doth not consist in a mere intelligent being, but in that peculiar manner of subsistence in that being which can be in no other. . . . There is a common Nature which must be joined with this manner of subsistence to make a person, otherwise it would be a mere mode.'[4] The meaning which Stillingfleet attaches to his own use of these terms is thus clear. He is simply pursuing the same truth as expressed more than two centuries previously by Nicolas of Cusa, when he said that 'the Persons are not Persons save in a state of union.'[5]

1 *The Distinction between Real and Nominal Trinitarians Examined*, chap. iii.

2 Chap. v. Melancthon had brought the word 'incommunicable' into his own definition, though without any 'separatist' notion. See *H. Sp. in Med. Ch.*, pp. 330 f.

3 *Vindication*, pp. 260 f.

4 *Ibid.*, pp. 72 f.

5 In the counter-attack on Socinianism both Howe and Matthew Henry made contributions to the debate on the personality of the Spirit. When in 1684 Howe published *The Redeemer's Tears wept over Lost Souls*, he added an Appendix in which he discourses on the sin against the Holy Spirit, with the usual inference. In the following year he wrote to his flock in London a letter in which he urges them not to grieve 'that Spirit of all love, goodness, sweetness, and benignity.' In commenting upon John xv. 26 in his *Exposition of the N.T.*, Henry affirms, with special reference to the Spirit's personality: 'We have more in this verse concerning the Holy Ghost than in any one verse beside in the Bible. . . . Here He is spoken of as a distinct Person, not a quality or property.'

IV

Up to this point, the usual view adopted by the Socinian party identified the Holy Spirit with God in the same sense in which the spirit of man is identified with man, with the result that the Holy Spirit was held to be simply the influence of God on the human mind. Whether the inconsistencies of Clarke in print were due to a desire to maintain friendly relations with the authorities of the Church, or to indecision or lack of mature judgement in his own mind, is not certain; yet the fact remains that his opponents could not easily make up their minds as to what he really believed concerning the Holy Spirit. It would seem, however, that he regarded Him as more than simply the Divine influence, for he writes: 'The Holy Spirit of God does not in Scripture generally signify a mere power or operation of the Father, but a real Person.'[1] But he reveals the sympathies which he had with the exponents of Arminianism in the omission of any declaration concerning the Spirit's procession from the Son, and for a reason of his own, further, that any such declaration might involve him in presupposing the full Divinity of the Son. So he writes: 'The Holy Spirit is not self-existent, but derives His being or essence from the Father, by the Son, as from the Supreme Cause.'[2] The Son clearly is not fully God, and therefore neither can that Spirit be, who is sent by Him: moreover, Clarke says elsewhere (see Chapter III) that the Father alone is fully God. For all that, no definite denial of the Spirit's personality emerges; even Gastrell's words imply it. '"Intelligent Being" and "Person" are all along used by him [Clarke] as synonymous terms,' Gastrell observes, 'so that, according to his scheme, the three Divine Persons must be three different Beings, individually distinct from each Other; and, as far as I can collect from his whole discourse, They must be of a different Nature too.'[3] Clarke had not used the term 'different.' He had, in fact, spoken of the Holy Spirit as 'not self-existent.' But the relationship of the Spirit to the Father, as expounded by Clarke, manifestly implied a difference in Nature, and, correspondingly, a triad

[1] *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, ii. § 22.
[2] *Ibid.*, § 19; also § 40.
[3] *Remarks upon Dr. Clarke's Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity.*

of 'three different Beings.' It is evident that Waterland also understood Clarke thus. On the one hand, the Divine Persons are not mere modes. 'A single Person,' he says, 'is an intelligent Agent, having the distinctive characters of I, Thou, He; and not divided, or distinguished into more intelligent Agents capable of the same characters.'[1] On the other hand, when we apply this definition to the Divine Persons, we realize that 'a Person is not separate Substance, nor, consequently, more Persons more Substances.'[2] 'Persons so united as to make one Being, may be one Being,' which, according to the Arian interpretation of the term They could never be.[3] Moreover, in answer to Clarke's position that the Father alone is fully God, he concludes: 'We believe the three Persons to have no separate existence independent of each Other.[4] . . . No one Person is one God exclusively of the other two Persons.'[5] While, then, the full Deity of the Spirit was what Clarke's opponents felt called upon principally to substantiate, they perceived that the course of the argument compelled them to do this by insisting also on a right view of His Personality.

With the renewal of the Unitarian Controversy by Priestley, the attack on the third Person of the Trinity reassumed its familiar form of a denial of His Personality first and foremost. Writing of the Holy Spirit in his *History of the Corruptions of Christianity*, Priestley maintains that 'the Apostles did not understand our Lord as speaking of a real person,' for they alluded to the Spirit as 'a divine power only' (cp. 1 Cor. ii. 11). Further, 'the figurative language in which the Holy Spirit and His operations are sometimes described by them is inconsistent with the idea of His being a separate Person; as being "baptized" with the Spirit, being "filled" with the Spirit, "quenching" the Spirit, &c.; in all which the idea is evidently that of a "power," and not that of a "person."' The Baptismal Formula recorded in St. Matthew's Gospel (xxviii. 19), which, in his opinion, probably gave rise to the belief in the Spirit's personality in the first place, meant no more to the primitive Christians than that the religion into

[1] *Second Vindication of Christ's Divinity*, p. 366.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 447.
[3] *First Vindication of Christ's Divinity*, p. 329 (query 22).
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 168 (query 9). [5] *Ibid.*, p. 349.

which people were to be baptized 'was given by the Father, by means of the Son, and confirmed by miraculous power.' The Apostles themselves, he observes, 'seem to have baptized in the name of Jesus only.' When, then, suggests Priestley, the innovation of the Spirit's personality did come in, it marked Him out as a subordinate Person, 'much inferior to God, and even to Christ'; but it is probable, he thinks, that the 'Apostolical Fathers' 'considered the Holy Spirit as a power, and not a Person.'

In pressing the similitude in 1 Cor. ii. 11 between the spirit of man and the Spirit of God, so as to infer that the Apostle denied a distinct personality to the latter, Priestley was seen to strain it to his own ends; for the τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ of the eleventh verse is supplemented by τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ('the Spirit that comes from God') of the twelfth. When, also, he referred to the orthodox position as upholding a 'separate' Person of the Holy Spirit, he made a reference which he could not verify; for any notion of separation as a necessary mark of Divine Personality was entirely foreign to orthodox teaching—in fact, it was an error which it never ceased to refute.[1] His exposition of the Baptismal Formula twisted it almost beyond recognition, and was utterly unconvincing; while his surmise as to the Apostles having 'baptized in the name of Jesus only' had surely received sufficient answer already from Lightfoot (see Chapter IV). Horsley found no serious difficulty in disposing of such objections.

The writings of Swedenborg leave no doubt whatever as to his denial of the personality of the Holy Spirit. To him the Spirit is the influence of Christ, or the love of God in operating power. On the other hand, those divines who are usually known as Christian Mystics never depersonalized the Holy Spirit, however near to this their language occasionally seems to go. Boehme, for instance, is not enamoured of the term 'Person' in reference to the Trinity, for Erdmann (*History of Philosophy*, i. p. 582) reports him as saying: 'God is not a

[1] 'Modern thought insists upon the separateness and self-included nature of personality—a conception unknown to antiquity.'—W. N. Clarke, *Outline of Christian Theology*, p. 170. Cp. *persona*, the actor's mask, or a character in a play. 'Distinction, not separation, is the mark of personality.'—Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, p. 30. We have seen that the Mediaeval Church made great use of this truth. W. L. Walker (*The Spirit and the Incarnation*, p. 336) puts it thus: 'It is impossible to think there can be the Spirit of a Spirit as a separate Person from that Spirit.'

Person except in Christ.' Nevertheless, he speaks of the Holy Spirit as 'the third self-subsisting Person in the Deity,' while keeping the proper distinction between the Divine and human understandings of the above term. This is clear from a reference to the Holy Spirit found in the *Aurora* (§ 3), in which He is described as 'a pleasant, meek, quiet Wind, or whispering Breath, or "still Voice," out of all the powers of the Father and of the Son. . . . Therefore,' he continues, 'if we will describe His Person, Substance, and Property, as distinct from the true Ground [possibly the *Ungrund*, or 'Abyss,' of his philosophy], it must be represented in a similitude. For the Spirit cannot be written down, being no creature, but the moving, flowing, boiling Power of God.' While He is likened to heat, fire, and air, He is distinguished from the elements by the exercise of reason, and by personal attributes and functions.

The personality of the Holy Spirit received especial emphasis in the experimental theology of Methodism. Butler had remarked, in his Essay *Of Personal Identity*, that 'it is not an idea, or abstract notion, or quality, but a being only, which is capable of life and action, of happiness and misery'; and Wesley, while assenting to the truth of this, realized the far-reaching nature of it when reviewing its essential connexion with the work of redemption and the inward witness of the Spirit. Not only, then, was the Spirit's personality a part of the Methodist creed; it was a conviction born of experience, without which, in Wesley's view, mere opinions were of little consequence. Accordingly, Methodist hymnology is itself a constant witness to this truth. 'To Charles Wesley the Holy Spirit is no mere influence, however sweet and gracious, but a living, active, present Person to whom prayer may be addressed, and with whom fellowship may be enjoyed, the witness to and with the believer's spirit.'[1] So great a part did such belief take in the life and thought of early Methodism that the movement needed to be defended from the charge of 'enthusiasm,' which was a misnomer for that which made Methodism a movement at all. The personality of the Spirit is therefore assumed and implied by Wesley where it is not actually stated, and the statements themselves are so many as hardly to need quotation from works so familiar. A reference

[1] Rev. F. L. Wiseman, in *A New History of Methodism*, vol. i. p. 248.

in his sermon 'On Grieving the Holy Spirit' assumes the Spirit's personality without question: 'We are said to grieve the Holy Spirit by our sins, because of His immediate presence with us. They are more directly committed under His eye, and are therefore more highly offensive to Him.' Another reason why the Holy Spirit is grieved by our sins is that 'they are so many contempts of the highest expression of His love.' This was Wesley's belief before he went to Georgia, and therefore could only have been confirmed with emphasis when, years later, he felt his heart 'strangely warmed.'[1] A glance at his *Notes on the New Testament* is sufficient to show how definitely he affirms the personality of the Holy Spirit. Commenting on John xv. 26, he writes: 'The Spirit's coming, and being sent by our Lord from the Father to testify of Him, are personal characters, and plainly distinguish Him from the Father and the Son; and His title as "the Spirit of truth," together with His proceeding from the Father, can agree to none but a Divine Person.' This is from one of the Doctrinal Standards of Methodism.

The attempts to define the term 'person' in regard to the Spirit, and the systematic treatment of it in its Divine sense, which we find in the course of the two centuries here under review, cannot fairly be dismissed as irrational. The evidence of the New Testament as to the distinction of the Spirit from the Father and the Son was not only regarded as overwhelming objectively, but also as, in large measure, lending itself to experimental tests.[2] Most of those who thought deeply on the subject came to realize, in Dr. W. N. Clarke's words, that 'the Holy Spirit is no mere influence, derived, secondary, impersonal, and vanishing, but is no other than God Himself, in vital contact and communication with the spirits of men.'[3] This is not to declare that because the Spirit is called the Spirit of Christ He must on that account be identified with the risen Lord. It may be that His self-effacing work, to speak, not from Himself, but whatsoever He shall hear, and to reveal Christ (see John xvi. 13 f.), has

[1] *Sermon CXXXV* (on Eph. iv. 30) was written in 1733.

[2] 'The Church has gained or lost in spiritual force as she has upheld passionately or lukewarmly the doctrine of the "personality" of the Spirit.'—*H. Sp. in Med. Ch.*, p. 331.

[3] *Outline of Christian Theology*, p. 372.

partly obscured the fact that He has a 'personality' of His own—not 'separate,' yet distinct; not identical with the glorified Saviour, but *including* Him;[1] and possessing 'character,' through which He is conceived as 'personal.'[2] When, therefore, by the unprejudiced use of reason, the evidence is conceded to be principally derived from revelation, it is by no means a sign of intellectual weakness to adopt the line of least resistance.

[1] W. L. Walker, *The Spirit and the Incarnation*, pp. 83, 88.
[2] *The Spirit: God and His Relation to Man* (ed. Streeter): art. by Prof. Anderson Scott, p. 149.

VII

THE WORK OF THE SPIRIT IN CREATION

> 'Truth, which implies reverence for fact, and even for what may seem trivial fact, is part of the very Being of God, and therefore any cynical or easy-going indifference to truth is itself an obstacle to real fellowship with Him, an obstacle which will far outweigh any temporary gain brought by associations believed in in spite of evidence.'
>
> C. W. Emmet (in *The Spirit*).

VII

THE WORK OF THE SPIRIT IN CREATION

I

Since the Age of the Fathers the Church had never hesitated to affirm the complete oneness of the three Divine Persons in creative action, and in the preservation and government of the universe. This was applied to the spiritual order, as well as to the material, in that the Deity was held to work constantly for the perfecting of His highest creation, the human soul, and, on that account, cannot be held responsible for the existence of moral evil. Side by side with such belief in this absolute unity of Divine action was the belief that in a special sense the Holy Spirit is the 'Lord and Giver of Life,' the effective Principle of life, going forth from the Father and the Son to perfect in love the concepts of the Divine Mind. Interpreting this as a 'temporal' procession for a specific purpose, the Greeks concurred, and referred the creative activity of God to form as much as to matter, to ideas as much as to substance.[1] In the West, Arminius thinks likewise of the particular function of the Holy Spirit in this connexion, for, writing on the word 'Spirit,' he mentions its use often with other words, such as in the terms, 'Spirit of Elohim,' 'Spirit of Jehovah,' 'Holy Spirit'; 'by which,' he remarks, 'it is indicated that He is the One through whom God the Father and the Son achieve everything (*omnia operantur*) in heaven and on earth.'[2] English Protestantism followed by emphasizing both the spheres in which this is true. The *Westminster Confession*, on the one hand, asserts 'the manifestation of the glory of His eternal power, wisdom, and goodness' as God's reason for making 'of nothing the world.'[3] Sterry, on the other hand, is anxious to show the spiritual nature of the laws which govern the created system, and therefore a definite manifestation of

1 Gavin, *Greek Orthodox Thought*, p. 149. Cp. the *Formula of Concord*: 'Opera Trinitatis ad extra sunt indivisa.'

2 *Thesis VI, de Sp. sanct.*, § 2. 3 iv. § 1.

God's glory in the spiritual nature of mankind. 'No man,' he says, 'that is led by the law of the Spirit of Life can walk contrary to any law of nature.'[1] The man of God displays in his own character the fundamental unity of both as being derived from and ordered by the one Spirit.

From this point the subject was carried a stage further by Cudworth in his *True Intellectual System of the Universe*, which, as would be expected, assumes the underlying truth of the Divine Creatorship of the Triune God. 'As in our creed the Holy Ghost is styled "The Lord and Giver of Life," this is not so to be understood as if therefore the first and second hypostases were to be excluded from having any causality therein.'[2] But how does the Divine causality operate? The reference in Gen. i. 2 to the moving of the Spirit of God upon the waters may have 'meant God Himself, as acting immediately upon the matter, or some other active principle derived from God, and not from matter, as a mundane soul, or plastic nature.'[3] Granted the existence of such an incorporeal substance as 'plastic nature,'[4] it must be derived from God, in whose perfect Being there is 'omni-causality';[5] and such teachers as Plutarch, Hermogenes, and others, who assert two self-existent principles, God and matter, are 'neither better nor worse than a kind of imperfect Theists.'[6] This 'plastic nature,' then, which is akin to the world-soul, or soul of the universe, figuring in Plato and Aristotle and revived in the Neo-Platonism of Erigena, is that by which nature is governed in accordance with law, and the work of creation carried forward. Being derived from God, its operations are dependent on His power and directed by His oversight.[7] It is not by any means itself the Deity, or the First Principle, as certain atheistic philosophers reason from their pantheistic or materialistic premises.[8] While suggestive, perhaps, of the Holy Spirit, it is not to be identified with Him, as would be gathered from the above comment on Gen. i. 2; and Origen plainly declares that 'the third hypostasis of the Trinity is not to be accounted, in a true and proper sense, the soul of

[1] *The Spirit's Conviction of Sin*, p. 34.
[2] iv. 36 (vol. ii. p. 402). [3] *Ibid.*, 14 (i. 400). [4] iii. 37, § 20 (i. 252).
[5] iv. 8 (i. 307). [6] *Ibid.*, 6, 7 (i. 300 ff.). [7] iii. 37, § 25 (i. 271).
[8] *Ibid.*, (272 f.). 'Nature is not the Deity itself, but a thing very remote from it.'—iii. 37, § 11 (i. 237).

the world.'[1] This appears to Cudworth to be a feasible theory of the Divine operation in creation. But in the dualistic form of it, as proclaimed by Plutarch[2] and certain of his associates, both ancient and modern, according to which God is responsible for the good while this other substantial principle is responsible for the evil, Cudworth sees only confusion and error. It is quite right to defend the Deity from imputations of responsibility for the presence of moral evil in the world, but this responsibility rests not on a 'principle' which is derived from the Deity Itself, but on man, for the wrongful exercise of his freedom of will.[3] Yet that very freedom was conferred on man by the Spirit of God, and no other explanation than that of Divine creatorship can sufficiently warrant the existence of such a spiritual nature as that which man possesses. 'No atheist,' writes Cudworth, 'who derives all from senseless atoms, or matter, is able to assign any cause at all of himself, or give any true account of the original of his own soul or mind, it being utterly inconceivable and impossible that soul and mind, sense, reason, and understanding, should ever arise from irrational and senseless matter, however modified.'[4]

The unity of the Deity in creative work is emphasized also by Owen. 'Every Person,' he declares, 'is the Author of every work of God, because each Person is God, and the Divine Nature is the same undivided principle of all Divine operations.'[5] Yet 'the Father is to be considered as the principal Author and Cause of all those works which are immediately wrought by either the Son or the Holy Ghost'; and 'this authority of the Father doth immediately respect the work itself, and not the Person working.'[6] They are 'the concluding, completing, perfecting acts' which 'are ascribed unto the Holy Ghost.'[7] Such did He accomplish in the creation (Gen. i. 2), bringing forth the 'inconceivable variety'

[1] *True Intellectual System*, iv. 36 (ii. 349).
[2] *Ibid.*, 13 (i. 331).
[3] *Ibid.*, (i. 344): see also iii. 37, § 6 (i. 226 f.).
[4] v. 1 (ii. 585); see also vol. iii.
[5] *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, pp. 96 ff.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 114.
[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 96 ff. These remarks follow Hooker rather closely: 'Whatsoever God doth work, the hands of all three Persons are jointly and equally in it according to the order of that connexion whereby They Each depend upon Other. And therefore albeit in that respect . . . the Spirit be last, and consequently nearest unto every effect which groweth from all Three, nevertheless, They All, being of one Essence, are likewise All of one efficacy' (*Eccles. Pol.*, v. chap. 56, § 5). At the same time, 'through the Spirit all things are' (*Ibid.*, i. chap. 2, § 2).

of nature,[1] and preserving the whole created order.[2] On the spiritual side of creation, Cudworth finds a supporter in Owen. The latter affirms that 'the creation of the human soul . . . is the immediate work of the Spirit of God (Job xxxiii. 4).'[3] The soul, however, rebelled against its Creator; consequently we find Scripture constantly speaking of the depravity of the human mind, which, by reason of this same rebelliousness, is fleshly and at enmity with God, and therefore needs to be renewed (Rom. xii. 2; Eph. iv. 23).[4] It is not very surprising to find Priestley numbering such a view among the 'corruptions' of Christianity. 'The doctrine of the utter inability of man to do the will of God, of the corruption of our nature by the Fall of Adam, and of our responsibility for it, were,' he protests, 'altogether unknown in the Primitive Church.'[5]

II

With the advent of 'the new philosophy' the whole question of the relationship of the natural order to an ultimate reality, in or over it, was subjected to a new examination from the standpoint of reason first and foremost. Much of what modern thought understands by materialistic explanations of the universe was in vogue in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and it was with this in mind that Butler wrote his *Analogy*, including in its purview those rationalist beliefs which Tindal and his fellow-Deists had deduced from such a position. 'Without an intelligent Author and Governor of nature,' says Butler, 'no account at all can be given how this universe, or the part of it particularly in which we are concerned, came to be, and the course of it to be carried on, as it is: nor any of its general end and design, without a moral Governor of it.'[6] 'To an unprejudiced mind,' he adds, 'ten thousand thousand instances of design cannot but prove a designer.'[7] There had been no lack of sympathy toward so emphatic a theism in the *Meditationes de prima philosophia* of Descartes, published nearly a century before, in which it

[1] *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, pp. 102 f.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 104. Similarly Waterland, *Second Vindication*, pp. 326 ff.
[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 106 f.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 494.
[5] *Corruptions of Christianity*, i. p. 295.
[6] i. 7.
[7] *Analogy*, ii. *Conclusion.*

was laid down that, as spirit and matter are so essentially different, only God could possibly unite them. There he had to be content, in his own view, to leave it—as a problem of 'dualism' which, again, only God could possibly solve. Nevertheless, Spinoza makes an effort to solve it. The one Infinite Substance, which we name God, possesses, he declares, two attributes of extension and thought. It is from these attributes that both spirit and matter arise, but they are both included in the one Divine Reality, if 'Reality' we may call it. All other than this one Infinite Substance are mere phenomena, modes of the existence of the Substance; whereas the finite, *qua* finite, has no existence.[1] The pantheistic theory thus revealed in Spinoza's *Ethics* (*Ethica Ordine Geometrico Demonstrata*) received pungent criticism from John Howe in the second part of his *Living Temple*. 'It little matters,' comments Howe, 'whether we make *nothing* to be God, or *everything*; whether we allow of no God to be worshipped, or leave none to worship Him. . . . Spinoza's attempt to identify and deify all substance, attended with that strange pair of attributes, extension and thought (and an infinite number of others besides), hath a manifest design to throw religion out of the world that way.'[2] On the other hand, there is at any rate one reflection upon Spinoza's thought which suggested truth to Froude in his examination of the philosopher's work. In his *Essay on Spinoza* he writes: 'If we shrink from regarding the extended universe, with Spinoza, as an actual manifestation of Almighty God, we are unable to rest in the mere denial that it is this. We go on to ask what it *is*, and we are obliged to conclude thus much at least of it, that every smallest being was once a thought in His mind; and in the study of what He has made we are really and truly studying a revelation of Himself.' In Froude's sense, however, this is more Froude than Spinoza, and we may safely trust the judgment of Howe, who was never too deep to be practical, that such a philosophy could not but prove hostile to religion as generally understood; for had not Spinoza himself dilated upon the divergence of their aims? There is, for instance,

1 Spinoza's pantheism captivated Goethe, as certain of his statements show; e.g. 'The true is godlike: it is not itself revealed to us; we have to infer it from its manifestations.'

2 Rogers, *Life and Character of John Howe*, pp. 238 f.

an essential unity between the Spirit of God and the spirit of man. But, as Owen argues (see Chapter VI), the Spirit of God and the spirit of man cannot be identical, for the human need of salvation can only be completely met by some *other* power, working not only for us, but in us.[1] Thus alone, indeed, can man retain and develop to the full his own personality.[2] Leibnitz restored the theistic basis. His theory of many active substances composing the one universe allows for the concurrent action of God and the energy of these substances, and upholds a unity in them all which postulates Divine creatorship. Since the essence of 'substance' is force, and force is of the nature of ultimate reality, the 'concurrence' between 'substance' and ultimate reality, or God, is sufficient to demonstrate the ground of unity between both, as touching essence itself. In face of such unity or harmony of the universe[3] the fact of evil is explained simply by the imperfection of the world, that is, by those natural limitations which a state of being created brings with it. The world, argues Leibnitz, is the best attainable in the nature of the case, the nature of the case being that man is not perfect, even though his will is not free !—which, as Froude observes, is like speaking of a quadrilateral triangle ! The determinism resulting from such a view of evil as a thing of pure metaphysics presents man with an excuse in place of a plan of salvation, and robs the doctrine of the Trinity, which Leibnitz defended, of all its truly redemptional character.

Francis Bacon, who led the protest of English philosophers against confusing the realms of faith and science,[4] regards the idea that the world is the image of God as pagan, and as definitely leading to false ideas of God Himself. Manifestly his desire is that no conception of the universe should impair the transcendence of the Creator. 'I believe,' so he writes in his *Confession of Faith*, 'that nothing is without beginning but God: . . . that He, by His eternal Word, created all things, and by His eternal Spirit doth comfort and preserve

[1] See Inge, *Christian Mysticism* (5th ed.), pp. 366 f.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 30. 'We feel that there must be something wrong with a system which ends in obliterating the distinction between the Creator and His creatures.'—*Ibid.*, p. 190. Also see Gore, *H. Sp. and the Church*, p. 100.

[3] Similarly Christian Wolff.

[4] *De dignitate et augmentis scientiarum*, iii. Cf. Erdmann, *Hist. of Phil.*, i. pp. 671 f.

them.' South chided Hobbes for straying from this position into a materialism which makes substance and matter the same. But they are not, affirms South, for there was the Substance of God in the universe before there was matter.[1] In fact, adds Berkeley, matter, or material existence, postulates the pre-existence of mind or Spirit, for the universe only can exist for us as, through the Infinite Spirit, it is mentally or spiritually conceived. The so-called material universe is essentially 'immaterial' or spiritual—one in which God is always manifesting Himself, one which itself God is constantly creating for us through our individual sense-perceptions.[2] Berkeley's work was invaluable in face of contemporary rationalism.

There is considerable resemblance in this to the teaching of Mysticism. Swedenborg sees in the whole creation a Divine unity, brought into being by the one Divine Spirit who pervades all things. The natural world is derived from the spiritual world. God sends forth a spiritual atmosphere, which is the basis of all that is material; and the atom, of electrical content, is produced by the spiritual atom which is part of this spiritual atmosphere. This may have been another, and a more theological, method of saying what he said earlier in Volume I of the *Opera Philosophica* (1734), where he speaks of matter as resulting from pure motion. The moral aspect of the case is by no means overlooked in Swedenborg's system: human beings, he holds, are constantly receiving renewal of life from Christ. Somewhat similar ideas of the spiritual groundwork of the created order are expressed in the writings of Boehme. The Divine Spirit, who Himself is the 'effect' of the interaction of 'darkness' and 'light' (Father and Son) within the Deity, creates the universe, not from nothing—as is so often stated—but from certain primal 'forms' in God, those principles which have their origin in the 'Ungrund.' The forms of things are, he says, brought forth by the Holy Spirit, of whom all nature is the mirror.[3] He accounts for the existence of evil in this Divinely created world in a manner suggestive of Leibnitz. Whereas Leibnitz attributes it to the

1 *Animadversions upon Dr. Sherlock's Book*, chap. ii.

2 *Principles of Human Knowledge.* A somewhat novel elaboration of this theme is found in his *Siris* (1744).

3 Erdmann, *Hist. of Phil.*, i. p. 586.

natural limitations of a created state, Boehme connects it closely with what he terms the 'wrath-principle' in God, and holds that all things are produced by the principle of negation, which is nearly related to evil.[1] Both theories have a deterministic force. But it must be admitted that, in Boehme's case, the Son and the Spirit are represented as in some way counteracting this wrath-principle, though the whole picture is crude in the extreme:—The Son endeavours to change the anger of the Father into love, and in this He receives the assistance of 'the very pleasant sweet-smelling and sweet-tasted Spirit.'[2] This is curious as coming from one whose philosophy of the 'Ungrund' so constantly insists on the complete unity of the Divine Being. The notion that the sacrifice of the Son was necessary to appease the anger of the Father was as repugnant to Swedenborg as it was to the best thought of the Catholic Church. On the subject of God in the created world, however, the observations of Boehme's ardent admirer, William Law, are characterized by a simplicity, and therefore by an impressiveness, so often found wanting in the work of his master. 'Could we,' he writes, 'see a miracle from God, how would our thoughts be affected with a holy awe and veneration of His presence! But if we consider everything as God's doing, either by order or permission, we shall then be affected with common things, as they would be who saw a miracle. For as there is nothing to affect you in a miracle, but as it is the action of God and bespeaks His presence; so when you consider God as acting in all things and all events, then all things will become venerable to you, like miracles, and fill you with the same awful sentiments of the Divine presence.'[3]

As would be expected, Wesley's pronouncements on the subject were in complete accord with those of the English Church. 'We have the fullest evidence,' he declares, 'that the eternal, omnipresent, almighty, all-wise Spirit, as He created all things, so He continually superintends whatever He has created. He governs all, not only to the bounds of creation, but through the utmost extent of space; and not only through the short time that is measured by the earth and

[1] *Aurora.*
[2] *Three Principles of the Divine Essence*, § 4.
[3] *Serious Call*, chap. xxii.

sun, but from everlasting to everlasting.' And to the Christian especially, 'the one, eternal, omnipresent, all-perfect Spirit is . . . not his Creator only, but his Sustainer, his Preserver, his Governor; yea, his Father, his Saviour, Sanctifier, and Comforter.'[1] Two later sermons on the Holy Spirit make reference to the 'Fall' as meaning the refusal of our first parents to be guided by the Spirit of God, who, in consequence, left them. But, it is added, by the atonement wrought by Christ, and the renewal of the same Spirit, we 'again bear the image of our Creator.'[2]

That the universe owes its origin to the one Divine Spirit was thus the general opinion of the thinkers of our period, and, whether the universe itself may justifiably be alluded to as an image or expression of God, as Boehme held and Bacon denied, it increasingly came to be regarded as affording abundant evidence of a great Designer, and, further, as itself existing for us only as it is presented by the same Creator Spirit through the senses and conceptions of the mind. An impartial survey of available facts would lead irresistibly to such a conclusion, not only as touching the universe in its material aspect, but also the highest created being of all, the human soul, made in the likeness of God. Against such convictions the suggestions of pantheism or of materialism made little or no headway within the realm of serious thought down to Wesley's time. The problem of evil arose as a problem at all simply because of the need which was felt for its presence to be reconciled in some fashion with the wisdom and love of the supreme Governor of the world. The attempts of Boehme and Leibnitz, in their different spheres, to explain evil in terms of metaphysics were not convincing; and Cudworth points out the temptation to do so in connexion with such an idea as 'the soul of the world,' though he mentions the snare only to expose it. It was borne in upon the great majority of these writers that evil can satisfactorily be accounted for, in a world of Divine creation, only by remembering that the human will possesses at least that amount of freedom whereby a selfish and downward exercise of it is possible, and, indeed, inviting, in view of the 'natural' tendencies of the race. Where such

[1] *Sermon CXIX* (Mark xii. 32), *On the Unity of the Divine Being.*
[2] *Sermons CXXXV* (Eph. iv. 30) and *CXXXVIII* (2 Cor. iii. 17).

a freedom was not acknowledged in connexion with evil, alternative solutions of the problem became more ingenious than profound, and therefore, for most people, were no solutions at all. On the other hand, where it was acknowledged, it was acknowledged also in connexion with those possibilities of good which could be made actual by the renewing of the Holy Ghost; so that the same Spirit who created the physical frame might also create within it 'a clean heart.' There is no creative work of the Spirit grander than this.

Appended Note

It is interesting to notice certain modern developments of views expressed by writers here considered. The relationship existing between matter and spirit, set forth at first as between absolutely irreconcilable principles, came to be expounded more as a drawing together of natural affinities. Sherlock could not emancipate himself entirely from the dualism which had been so great a puzzle to Descartes, and in his *Vindication* he declares: 'The world is divided into matter and spirit, and we know no more what the substance of matter, than what the substance of a spirit, is' (p. 7). At the same time, there is an indication here of a certain inquiry into the essence of matter which may not have left this division unbridgable in his mind; and we have been reminded of Cudworth's protest against the notion that matter and the Infinite Spirit are two self-existent principles. Thus, in a measure, we may have been prepared for Berkeley's theory of an 'immaterial' universe which is the manifestation of the Infinite Spirit to finite spirits, and Swedenborg's theory of an immaterial or spiritual basis of the material universe. These theories have been further developed by modern pronouncements. Speaking on 'The Electrical Structure of Matter' at a meeting of the British Association, 1923, Prof. Sir Ernest Rutherford said there was the strongest evidence that atoms were built up of two electrical units—the electron and the hydrogen nucleus or proton. 'It is probable,' he continued, 'that these two are the fundamental and indivisible units which build up our universe, but we may reserve in our minds the possibility that further inquiry may some day show that these units are

complex and divisible into even more fundamental entities.' This, at least, is a suggestion of the 'immaterial' foundation. Sir Oliver Lodge followed at the same meeting with an address in which he emphasized the almost infinite rarity of matter, and the impossibility of drawing any sure line between what is, and what is not, matter. On the subject of Creation he spoke thus: 'The sun pours out energy and the earth catches less than one thousand-millionth of the whole. True, the energy we do catch does the whole of our work, but the great bulk of it has been going away into space for a thousand million years. Every star has been pouring out force simultaneously for all these millions of centuries. What becomes of it? Perhaps in the far depths of space that energy is absorbed, and producing new matter and increasing the dust cloud on the outer verges of this universe of ours.' Sir Oliver remarked that, until Einstein's theory of relativity, we only knew the nature of relative energy, not of absolute energy; but now we are beginning to get some idea of absolute energy, the energy which forms matter, and so to grasp the closeness of relation between energy and matter. In this connexion the particular form of energy referred to was light. 'If,' said Sir Oliver, 'you translated light into a vortex, you might generate an electron, for we may think of an electron as a speck spinning like a sleeping top in the ether. The generator of matter would be light, acting like a whirlwind.'[1] This, he held, tends to show that radiation produces matter, that, therefore, the universe has been created by light, and may 'endlessly' recreate itself by the power of light. Following the premonitions of Berkeley and the rest, we may at least appreciate the suggestiveness of the above in respect of the doctrine of the Divine immanence, of the truth that the Creator Spirit pervades all the universe which He has made. Regarding the power of light, such passages as Ps. civ. 2; Isa. xlv. 7; and 1 John i. 5 are significant; while in commenting on Gen. i. 3, Driver states: 'Things do not emanate from Him unconsciously, nor are they produced by a mere act of thought, as in some pantheistic systems, but by an act of *will*.' Bearing this in mind, we shall be saved from

[1] Referring to the vortex-theory of matter. Water spun fast enough behaves like a solid. Matter, then, is possibly 'ether in circulation.'

pantheism; for the transcendence of the Divine Spirit thus receives equal emphasis with His immanence. If it were not to receive this, Divine immanence, by which we mean 'God is all,' would scarcely be differentiated from pantheism, by which is meant 'All is God'—or, as Dr. Pringle-Pattison observes—that God is *equally* present in everything: which leads to moral confusion. 'I think,' said Sir Oliver Lodge,[1] 'there is a clear distinction to be drawn between Immanence and Pantheism. Immanence is consistent with Transcendence. The doctrine of human free-will, and the consequent element of divinity in man, are essential to the understanding of the whole. Pantheism is liable to slur over many facts and realities.' In the Christian view, however, as Dr. Pringle-Pattison reminds us, the Transcendent *is* the Immanent, for it is 'the presence of the Infinite in the finite.'[2] This idea is finely put by Sir Oliver Lodge at the close of his Presidential Address to the British Association in 1913: 'We are deaf and blind to the Immanent Grandeur, unless we have insight enough to recognize in the woven fabric of existence, flowing steadily from the loom in an infinite progress towards perfection, the ever-growing garment of a transcendent God.' Hence, suggestions and indications of a spiritual or 'immaterial' basis of the universe, which are found in certain of the earlier as well as of the modern leaders of thought, must not be regarded as justifying the pantheistic theory; but, if allowed to have spiritual significance, they should rather be held to point to the immanence of the infinite personal Spirit.

Berkeley seems to feel that it is not easy for every one to arrive at full belief in the Divine creatorship of the world. The universe is that which, he says, must be spiritually conceived. So, as Professor E. S. Waterhouse admits,[3] a causal order 'is not written on the face of Nature, nor is it revealed until man for his own purposes seeks it. But the universe responds to the postulate, and satisfies our practical and intellectual needs in this respect.' And, surely, Nature can only be grasped as part of the great purpose of God. What

[1] In a letter to the writer, February 14, 1924.
[2] In *The Spirit: God and His Relation to Man* (ed. Streeter), p. 22.
[3] *The Philosophy of Religious Experience*, p. 253.

are millions of atoms, till thought fashions them into beauty? And further, in the words of Principal D. S. Cairns, 'one could have no joy in the beauty of Nature, if Nature were all.' It is when joy deepens into wonder that spiritual conceptions begin to receive encouragement, and Berkeley's idea of the universe as a self-manifestation of God may take shape in the mind. Moreover, the emergence of the soul in the created order cannot be satisfactorily explained apart from Divine creatorship. As Dr. Waterhouse remarks,[1] 'the religious postulate is a precondition of human evolution in its higher stages.' 'All nature is more than nature, in so far as there is the divinity of life, of spirit, in it.'[2] In other words, the undoubted spiritual nature of man is a phenomenon for which no merely evolutionary process can properly account, just as certainly as that the evolutionary process cannot guarantee inevitable progress for such a spiritual nature. Indeed, it may be true to say, with Dr. W. L. Walker,[3] that 'there cannot be any personal presence of God in Nature till we reach a personality in Nature capable of expressing the Divine personal presence.'

Such considerations of the character of the Divine Being and of the possession by man of the power of self-determination had already been sufficient to warrant the judgement of the Mediaeval Church that God cannot possibly be held accountable for moral evil:[4] now they were held sufficient to warrant a revolt from the metaphysical view of evil taken by Leibnitz which essentially made God similarly accountable. 'Realization of human free-will,' says Sir Oliver Lodge, 'is needed to understand the problem of evil.'[5] 'If man had not the power to do wrong,' he says again, 'he would have no kinship with Divinity.'[6] This naturally implies the power to do right, and in this connexion the Greek Church has believed in the *potential* goodness of the first state of man (due to the co-operation of the Holy Spirit), apart from which 'the Fall would have been impossible.'[7] Professor Waterhouse offers as a suggestion

1 *The Philosophy of Religious Experience*, p. 197.
2 A. Clutton-Brock, in *The Spirit*, &c., p. 346.
3 *The Spirit and the Incarnation*, p. 280. Also see pp. 287 ff.
4 *H. Sp. in Med. Ch.*, p. 333. 5 Personal letter.
6 At the British Association, 1923.
7 Frank Gavin, *Greek Orthodox Thought*, p. 164.

—not, he says, a solution—that, in order to defeat evil, God chose 'to call into existence a subordinate order of beings, that through them this aspect of His will might be fulfilled'; [1] but this has a flavour of determinism which does not help it to impress, and which all the emphasis on the co-operation of God cannot entirely dispel. Such a suggestion would at least encourage the feeling that the factor of first importance is the necessity of defeating the forces of evil *somewhere*, while that of second importance is the unfortunate human race, which is destined to bring the struggle to a head largely at its own expense. On the other hand, when we concentrate on the human race first and foremost, and then wonder how a perfectly good Creator could allow sin to arise in the midst of it, we are confronted by the assertion on the part of science that what has been known as the 'Fall' was not actually so in a moral sense, but rather a necessary stage in human development. Here the words of the late Professor H. M. Gwatkin are illuminating. 'Is it not,' he once said,[2] 'a transition from mere innocence into a self-consciousness which, though it may be a "fall" for a moment, is a necessary condition for a higher rise? It is only through the experience of suffering that even the sinless man could grow in grace. So the "Fall" is a step upward in moral consciousness. If God allowed sin in the world, the reason must be that the alternative is worse. The only alternative is that men would do right as machines. Moral consciousness, even in sin, is a higher state than mere innocence.' Similar reasons must be adduced for the Divine permission for sin to continue in the world; for to prevent the evil results of sin on man's part would be to rid him of the responsibility for his own voluntary action, while to compel his abandonment of sin would be to deprive him of voluntary action altogether. One cannot help but wonder, however, how events would have turned, if, at the dawn of moral consciousness upon developing humanity, when the intellectual faculties followed on the primary instincts, the power of moral choice had been more nobly exercised. If moral consciousness, even while choosing the wrong, is a higher state than mere innocence, moral conscious-

[1] *Philosophy of Religious Experience*, p. 179.
[2] Lecturing in Emmanuel College, Cambridge, 1911.

ness in choosing the right is a still higher state ; and if it may be admitted that the animal tendencies of early man were influenced by spiritual forces of evil, it must also be admitted that the Spirit of God, without whose creative activity man's spiritual nature could never have been bestowed, would certainly not have withheld His own uplifting influence from the objects of His love, whereby they would have received power to choose the right. We cannot say less than this without falling into determinism with all its unfairnesses. On the other hand, we can say more, namely that no over-mastering evolutionary idea, sometimes very much misunderstood, need confine us to the belief that spiritual progress must necessarily be slow. Our Lord's teaching on the coming of the Kingdom affords an altogether different conception, a conception which grows in wonder the more it is realized.

VIII

THE WORK OF THE SPIRIT IN INSPIRATION

'God never more honoured His true prophets than when there were most false ones.'—JOHN OWEN.

VIII

THE WORK OF THE SPIRIT IN INSPIRATION

I

The Christian Church always believed that the Holy Spirit inspires in a measure the reasoning faculty of every human being, particularly the deeper self or soul of all believers; but it also declared that in a special manner the writers of the Scriptures had been inspired by the Spirit of Truth for the purpose of presenting to mankind the Divine plan of salvation, and to the Church the principles it required for its guidance. Since the writers themselves were the primary objects of such inspiration, it was realized in the course of the mediaeval period that account must be taken of the human element involved, and the opinion came to be widely expressed that the Spirit of God imparted His messages to both prophets and apostles as they were spiritually prepared to receive them. Accordingly, the belief in verbal inspiration, held so tenaciously by the Fathers, was discouraged by the Schoolmen and by some of the Reformers, and was not seriously revived in the West until the seventeenth century. In the period now under consideration, the Eastern Church defined inspiration as the co-operation of the inspired person and the Holy Spirit, in the sense that the former 'abandons neither reason, conscience, nor will,' though he is preserved by the Holy Spirit from actual error.[1] Again, while, on the one hand, the Lutheran and Reformed Churches had held that the Holy Spirit vouchsafes His own interpretation in the act of influencing the individual mind, Roman Catholic teaching, on the other hand, had referred to Church authority and tradition as equal to the authority of the Scriptures. Similarly it was the belief of the Eastern Church that the Holy Spirit imparts revelations not only through the Scriptures but also through uncorrupted tradition, there being, so it assumed, no evidence that all truth was given finally in the Scriptures (cf. John xiv.

[1] Gavin, *Greek Orthodox Thought*, p. 16.

26).[1] The *Formula of Concord*, together with certain other Protestant symbols of the later sixteenth century and the earlier seventeenth, valued the utterances of the Councils, of the Fathers, and of the Ecumenical Creeds, as standard witnesses to Christian truth, but never regarded them as possessing an authority equal to that of Scripture.[2] The *Formula* speaks of the truths contained in Scripture as being in a unique sense delivered by the Holy Spirit, other writings, though inspired, not being inspired to the same degree. Hence the Scriptures may be said to be the Word of God peculiarly. This being so, the preaching of the Word and the giving heed to it (*auscultatio*) are instruments of the Holy Spirit by which He seeks to convert men and to carry forward within their hearts His perfecting work; 'for,' says the *Formula*, 'the Holy Spirit is present with His power in the ministry of the Word, and by means of that He endeavours to accomplish salvation for mankind.' For 'enthusiasts' such as were found in certain sects within Protestant Mysticism, who regarded both Word and Sacraments as unnecessary to salvation, the Lutheran framers of the *Formula* had no respect whatever.[3]

Arminian theology insisted on an inseparable connexion between the Word and the influence of the Holy Spirit. The *Confession of the Remonstrants* states that 'the Divine call is made and fulfilled through the preaching of the Gospel and the power of the Holy Spirit added thereto (xvii. 2).' Through the preached Word the Spirit confers grace, to the stimulation of faith by which salvation may be obtained.[4] Limborch followed suit. In his conviction, there is a Divine call made externally through the Word of God, whether in

[1] Tradition (*ἐκκλησιαστικὴς παράδοσις*) is interpreted as *δόγματα παραδεδομένα ἐκ στόματος ἀπὸ τοὺς ἀποστόλους, καὶ τοῦτα ἑρμηνεύθησαν ἀπὸ τὰς συνόδους καὶ τοὺς ἁγίους πατέρας* (*Conf. Orth.*).

[2] E.g. the Protestant rejection of five of the seven sacraments of the Roman and Orthodox Churches as lacking scriptural warrant for being so regarded.

[3] 'Rejicimus enthusiastarum errorem, qui fingunt Deum immediate absque verbi Dei auditu et sine sacramentorum usu homines ad se trahere, illuminare, justificare, et salvare.'

[4] 'Sp.s. omnibus et singulis, quibus verbum fidei ordinarie praedicatur, tantum gratiae confert, aut saltem conferre paratus est, quantum ad fidem ingenerandum et ad promovendum suis gradibus salutarem ipsorum conversionem sufficit' (xvii. 8). Hermann Rathmann († 1628), Protestant pastor at Danzig, insisted that the co-operation of the Spirit is necessary *before* any good whatever can be derived from the Scriptures.

preaching or reading. There is also a Divine call made internally by the same Spirit, by which the hearts of men are moved so that they obey the call made externally through the Word. 'Yet,' he adds, 'this internal call is not the power of the Spirit working separately from the Word, but it is inherent through and in the Word, so that, indeed, there may be one and the same call, but one which in different respects is termed external and internal. For since the Spirit never operates without the Word, and the Word is never forsaken by the Spirit, hence those who are called by the Word are likewise granted by the Spirit as much as is necessary for conversion and faith.'[1] To state that the Spirit operates through the Word was a useful reminder in those days when scepticism and sacramentarianism were making their own assaults on the evangelical position, but to go further and state that the Spirit never operates apart from the Word was to indulge in an exclusive overemphasis which characterized all these later Arminian teachers, with the notable, and familiar, exception of Grotius. The reappearance of the theory of verbal inspiration in the seventeenth century seems to have been due principally to the writings of the French Protestants, who exceeded even the Arminians in the importance they attached to the letter of Scripture. When Cappel's Biblical scholarship led him to question such a theory he soon found himself in trouble,[2] as indeed did Wetstein later in Arminian circles, on a similar account. Protestant theology on the Continent did not favour any other doctrine of inspiration of Holy Writ, and therefore afforded little encouragement to the science of textual criticism which was beginning to ask for a restatement of the case.

English Protestant theology in the first part of the seventeenth century was consistently emphatic with regard to a special inspiration of the Scriptures on the part of the Holy Spirit. Hooker writes: 'That which the Son doth hear of the Father, and which the Spirit doth receive of the Father and the Son, the same we have at the hands of the Spirit as being the last, and therefore the nearest to us in order, although in power the same with the second and the

1 *Theologia Christiana*, iv. 12.
2 See Fisher, *Hist. of Christian Doc.*, p. 343.

first.'[1] Cartwright speaks in like manner.[2] In his *Religion of Protestants* Chillingworth's main thesis is that the Scriptures are the supreme guide in spiritual matters, especially in salvation. 'The Bible, I say, the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants. . . . In a word, there is no sufficient certainty but of Scripture only for any considering man to build upon. . . . I am fully assured that God does not, and therefore that men ought not to, require any more of any man than this—to believe the Scripture to be God's Word, to endeavour to find the true sense of it, and to live according to it.'[3] The Jesuit character in the book, with whom he argues, asserts 'that the Holy Ghost, speaking only in Scripture, is no more intelligible to us than the Scripture in which He speaks': to which the author makes reply that the Holy Ghost explains fully to the believing mind the truth which He Himself has embodied in Scripture, and therefore no decrees of the Church are required to make His meaning more explicit.'[4] 'The Scripture, we say, is a perfect rule of faith.'[5] Not only will the watchful eye of Divine Providence take care of the purity of its text,[6] but also the Holy Ghost, who directed the choice of the books in the canon, will continue to interpret the truths which they contain.[7] If it is pleaded that certain passages of Scripture still remain obscure, and that therefore the Church must pronounce authoritatively upon them, the answer is that the meaning of such passages need not be unduly explored, for it cannot be necessary to salvation.[8] The Bible itself, adds Chillingworth, makes it clear whenever difficulties arise as to questions of Divine pronouncement. St. Paul is careful to distinguish between his own private judgment and the Divine revelations which had been made to him (1 Cor. vii. 12, 25), and 'if we will pretend that . . . his judgment was God's commandment, shall we not plainly contradict St. Paul and that Spirit by which he wrote?'[9] 'The apostles . . . in their writing were infallibly assisted to propose nothing as a Divine truth but what was so. The Church is also led into all truth, but it is by the intervening of the apostles' writings.'[10] Much that is found in Chillingworth's book is also found in

1 *Eccles. Polity*, i. chap. ii. § 2.
2 See *Harmonia Evangelica* (on John xiv. 21–27).
3 vi. 56. 4 ii. 13. 5 *Ibid.*, 14. 6 *Ibid.*, 24.
7 *Ibid.*, 96. 8 *Ibid.*, 127. 9 iii. 32. 10 *Ibid.*, 34.

the Puritan theology of the day. The *Westminster Confession* states that everything necessary to salvation is contained in Scripture, and further, that the inward illumination of the Spirit of God is necessary for the saving understanding of such things as are revealed in it.[1] In fact, we are assured, by 'the witness of the Spirit,' of its infallibility.[2] This being so, 'the supreme Judge, by whom all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of councils . . . can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in Scripture.'[3] The inward illumination spoken of in the *Confession* is emphasized by Sterry, one of the Westminster divines, as being different from that derived from any human mind. Says he, 'Though the candle of reason excel in light the glow-worms of sense, yet is it but a candle, not the sun itself: it makes not day; only shines in the darkness of the night.'[4] 'You cannot understand spiritual things rationally; that is, upon the grounds of reason.'[5] 'The soul shuts the windows of sense when she would have the room filled with the light of reason,' he continues. 'Reason's self must first be cast into a deep sleep and die, before she can rise again in the brightness of the Spirit.'[6] On the other hand, the inspiration that is from God is really from the whole Trinity, though, as Hooker said, the third Person, as nearest to us, passes on to us immediately what is spoken within the Divine Mind. 'All three Persons in the Trinity are Truth,' observes Sterry, 'but with Their several and distinct idioms or characters. . . . The Father is Truth in the root (James i. 17). The Son is Truth in the image (Col. i. 15). The Spirit is Truth in the irradiation or discovery (1 John v. 7; John xv. 26).'[7] Such Divine imparting of truth is an infinitely safer guide than the uncertain reasonings of the finite mind. Then, more closely applying all this to his hearers, the Members of Parliament, Sterry proceeds: 'Do you grieve to think . . . that so bright a day hath dawned[8] from the Person of the Lord Jesus; and yet you sit spinning out your counsels and courses by the candle-light of man's spirit and policy, as in the night?[9] . . . Take heed of measuring Divine things by the model of reason. Take heed of rejecting what reason cannot receive.[10]

1 i. 6. 2 *Ibid.*, 5. 3 *Ibid.*, 10. 4 *Sermon on John xvi.* 8, p. 10.
5 *Ibid.*, p. 12. 6 *Ibid.*, p. 13. 7 *Ibid.*, p. 14.
8 This Sermon was preached five months after the decisive battle of Naseby.
9 *Ibid.*, p. 21. 10 *Ibid.*, p. 26.

. . . Spiritual truths discovered by demonstrations of reason are like the mistress in her cook-maid's clothes. They differ from themselves in their own true shape, as those little plump boys with wings, the pictures of angels in churches, differ from the angels in heaven. . . . So heavenly things lose their majesty, become weak and contemptible, when they are represented by reason only : for they are not the things themselves, but an apish, mimical imitation of them.' [1] Sterry's great contemporary, John Lightfoot, was particularly concerned about the acceptance of this Divine illumination as claimed to be uniquely found in the Bible. He warns his readers against a too eager criticism of the text of Scripture. Beza, he says, casts suspicion on the text ' in hundreds of places.' ' Truly it is a daring that deserves castigation in him, that when he either understandeth not the perfect meaning of a place, or findeth difficulty in it, or hath fancied a sense contrary to it, that he should throw dirt into the face of the Scripture, and deny the purity of the Greek text, before he will ungive anything of his own groundless opinion.' [2] Lightfoot, with all his learning, expresses the conviction that ' the Holy Ghost wrote the Scriptures for man's salvation,' [3] suggesting a sure indication of their inspiration in the fact that the more deeply they are delved into, the more riches they yield. The same assertion is made by Baxter. ' The Holy Ghost,' he writes, ' by immediate inspiration, revealed to the Apostles the doctrine of Christ, and caused them infallibly to indite the Scriptures.' Moreover, ' the Holy Spirit assisteth us in our hearing, reading, and studying the Scriptures,' ' opening the heart ' that the Gospel may be apprehended by ' saving illumination.' ' And the Holy Spirit doth, by sanctifying the heart, possess it with such a love to God, and heaven, and holiness, and truth, as is a wonderful advantage to us in our studies.' [4] The studious employment of one's own mind, or faculty of reason, was, in Baxter's opinion, as it had been in Chillingworth's, a duty to be encouraged ; for Christian apologetics required every possible reinforcement against the gathering

[1] *Sermon on John xvi.* 8, p. 27.

[2] *Commentary on Acts* (vi. 7).

[3] So the *Orthodox Confession* of the Eastern Church, that the Holy Spirit is Author of O.T. and N.T. (Q. lxxii).

[4] *Christian Directory*, pt. i. ii. 5.

forces of scepticism and Socinianism. It was the peril of unsanctified reason against which Sterry so solemnly warned his hearers, and Baxter would have been in complete agreement with him here. The leaders of Christian thought in England were not so amateurish in religion as to divorce inspiration from reason, and no better examples of believers in them both can be found in those years than the Cambridge Platonists. Those who are inspired by the Holy Spirit 'are not,' declares Cudworth, 'to be accounted enthusiasts, as the word is now commonly taken in a bad sense; because the Spirit of God is no irrational thing, but either the very selfsame thing with reason, or else such a thing as Aristotle somewhere calls λόγου τι κρεῖττον, "a certain better and diviner thing than reason," and Plotinus ῥίζαν λόγου, "the root of reason."'[1] This holds good whether the inspiration immediately thought of concerns the Scriptures, the Church as a whole, or its individual members.

II

In the course of the Trinitarian and Unitarian controversies the subject of inspiration received further consideration in connexion with textual criticism, in relation to human reason, and as applying directly to the individual mind. On this last point Pearson is emphatic as regards the utter necessity for Divine enlightenment within, before man is able to fulfil the purposes of God. 'Whatsoever is wanting in our nature of that holiness and perfection must be supplied,' he insists, 'by the Spirit of God: and thus we affirm not only the revelation of the will of God, but also the illumination of the soul of man, to be part of the office of the Spirit of God.'[2] The same spiritual preparation is necessary, Owen believes, to a right understanding of God's Word; for 'although the letter of the Scripture and the sense of the propositions are equally exposed to the reason of all mankind, yet the real spiritual knowledge of the things themselves is not communicated unto any but by the especial operation of the Holy Spirit.'[3] Apart from the efficacy of the Holy Spirit in the soul, Scripture

[1] *True Intellectual System*, iii. 29 (vol. i. p. 199).
[2] *Exposition of the Creed* (*Art. VIII*), ii. 1.
[3] *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, Preface.

is 'a dead letter'; [1] and 'he that would utterly separate the Spirit from the Word, had as good burn his Bible.' [2] On turning, therefore, to the Bible we perceive that Divine inspiration directed the Old, as well as the New, Testament, as certain passages in the New Testament indicate (2 Pet. i. 20 f.; 2 Tim. iii. 16; &c.); [3] indeed, 'the Spirit that was in the prophets of old . . . is called the Spirit of Christ (1 Pet. i. 10 f.).' [4] In inspiring those men 'God sometimes made use of an articulate voice,' as in the case of Moses; at other times He made use of dreams and visions.[5] But, howsoever the inspiration was bestowed, the inspiration itself meant 'the preparation and elevation of their intellectual faculties' without, of necessity, imparting to them 'a distinct understanding' of all they received; and in influencing their faculties the Holy Spirit 'made use of them to express His words, not their own conceptions.' Prophecy 'was not a fruit of any men's private conceptions' (2 Pet. i. 20). And all this the Spirit of God accomplished 'with that light and evidence of Himself . . . as left them liable to no suspicion whether their minds were under His conduct and influence, or no.' [6] So we may say that He took account of the human nature of those whom He inspired, not by leaving them to clothe His subject-matter with their own words, but rather by suggesting to them words that they themselves had been in the habit of using.[7] We must not understand, however, that such inspiration implied any deeper influence on the character of those who were the objects of it. The Holy Spirit has spoken through very ungodly persons, as, for example, Balaam and Caiaphas. 'The gift of prophecy is granted not to be in itself and its own nature a sanctifying grace.' [8] As to the ways of Divine inspiration in modern times Owen concludes: 'I do not think that the Spirit worketh supplications in us by an immediate, supernatural, Divine afflatus, so as He inspired the prophets of old, who oft-times understood not the things uttered by themselves. . . . But I do say that the Spirit of God doth graciously in the prayers of believers carry out and act their souls and minds in desires and requests, which for the matter of them are far above

1 *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, p. 47.
2 *Ibid.*, p. 218.
3 *Ibid.*, pp. 139 ff.
4 *Ibid.*, p. 57.
5 *Ibid.*, pp. 147 f.
6 *Ibid.*, pp. 143 ff.
7 *Ibid.*, pp. 158 f.
8 *Ibid.*, p. 154.

their natural contrivances and invention.'[1] Owen's critic, William Clagett, in taking up certain of the points in Owen's book, sees a Calvinistic background to the assertion that is found in the Preface, to the effect that the real spiritual knowledge of the statements of Scripture is not communicated to any but by the special operation of the Holy Spirit; accordingly he denies that the promises of the Spirit are solely for a few 'elect,' and that only the 'regenerate' can discuss the things of the Spirit or understand 'the mysteries of the Gospel.'[2] No immediate revelation is required, he affirms, to make known the sense of Scripture, because all that is needful and profitable can be discovered by devotion to God and to study. The promise that our heavenly Father will give the Holy Spirit to those who ask Him (Luke xi. 13) does not warrant any belief in immediate revelation.[3] But Owen had simply laid down the apostolic rule that spiritual things must be spiritually discerned. Again, Clagett feels safe in attacking Owen's assertion that inspiration in itself does not necessarily include sanctifying operations. His belief is that when the Holy Spirit thus operates on the mind, He does in actual fact create certain spiritual qualities within it; and he refuses to concede that, just because the Spirit imparted certain extraordinary gifts to the primitive Church, it must now be assumed that He illumines, but refuses to sanctify, Christians of later ages.[4] Owen, however, had never declared that the Holy Spirit, even in one instance, would refuse to sanctify any person whom He chooses to employ for a specific purpose. His position was that whereas inspiration may easily be conceived as operating apart from saving faith, sanctification can never be so conceived: while the creation of spiritual qualities, which Clagett believes to accompany inspiration, is not borne out by all the facts, nor, indeed, should we expect it so to be, since the Spirit of God never confers morality mechanically, or by irresistible measures, for the same reason. Clagett, it may be noted finally, intensely disliked extempore prayers. They are 'performances,' in his opinion, and without the true inspiration of the Divine Spirit (!).[5]

1 *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, p. 468.
2 *Discourse concerning the Operations of the Holy Spirit*, Introduction, §§ 1 and 2.
3 *Ibid.*, pt. i. chap. v. § 1. 4 *Ibid.*, i. 2. 5 *Ibid.*, v. 3

The growing intellectual freedom which characterized the latter half of the seventeenth century appears in a measure in the observations on the subject of inspiration occasionally let fall by Sherlock and those who came after him. It would seem that Sherlock's own insistence on the proper use of reason was largely bound up with his defence of his notion of the Trinity, which he regarded as eminently reasonable ; but he was also at pains to show that reason and revelation are not essentially antagonistic. 'Revelation,' he writes, 'cannot contradict plain reason, for truth can never contradict itself.' It is by no means enough to *imagine* at any time a contradiction between them ; 'we must be sure that there *is* such a contradiction,'[1] which is a very different thing. If we are convinced that a contradiction exists, it will be our duty either to be more certain of the revelation, or of the grounds of our reasoning, or of both ; for the proper use of revelation is simply to supplement what reason cannot discover.[2] A second expression of the new intellectualism was a revival of that wanton criticism of the text of Scripture which had drawn a protest from John Lightfoot. Defenders of orthodoxy did not always seem to care whether they weakened their own position or not, if only they could present posers which their Unitarian opponents could not answer. 'Is this to act like wise men,' asks Stillingfleet, 'to raise objections against the authority of the Books [of Scripture] they cannot answer ; and to cry out of false copies and translations without reason, and to render all places suspicious which make against them ?'[3] The Bishop gives no sanction to the suspicions cast on 1 John v. 7 (A.V.), a text which he considers of evidential value on behalf of the doctrine of the Trinity. Those words were read, he says, in the Greek and Latin Churches, and, while there is undoubtedly some divergence in the early manuscripts, they are contained in several Greek copies.[4] It may have been that Stillingfleet somewhat exaggerated the danger of the position of orthodoxy due to textual criticism, at least in his own period, for Samuel Clarke, the leader of the next Unitarian attack, avowed his own belief in the Holy Spirit as the Inspirer

[1] *Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, p. 147.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 148.
[3] *A Discourse in Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, p. 120.
[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 164 ff.

of the prophets of the Old Testament and the apostles of the New.[1] On the other hand, it was not always safe to take Clarke exactly at his word ; and no great surprise may be occasioned when we hear Waterland charging Clarke's friend with ' pretending to speak plainer than the Holy Spirit has dictated.' [2] The exaltation of reason and the revival of the critical spirit already noticed, each having its own effect on the Church's doctrine of inspiration, were joined in the course of the eighteenth century by a form of intellectualism which passed sweeping judgements on the interpretation of Scripture passages apart from all principles of true scholarship. In this respect Priestley and his Unitarian circle were notorious offenders, who did not hesitate to strengthen their case by quietly assuming this or that unwelcome passage to be merely metaphorical. In his *Tracts in Controversy with Dr. Priestley*, principally in the *Letters*, Horsley takes him to task for it. ' I fear, Sir,' he writes, ' it hath been the custom of late to lay too much stress upon Jewish idioms in the exposition of the didactic parts of the New Testament. The Gospel is a general revelation. If it is delivered in a style which is not perspicuous to the illiterate of any nation except the Jewish, it is as much locked up from general apprehension as if the sacred books had been written in the vernacular gibberish of the Jews of that age. The Holy Spirit, which directed the apostles and the evangelists to the use of the tongue which in their day was the most generally understood—the Greek—would, for the same reason, it may be presumed, suggest to them a style which might be generally perspicuous. It is therefore a principle with me, that the true sense of any phrase in the New Testament is, for the most part, what may be called a standing sense ; that which will be the first to occur to common people of every country, and in every age.' [3] ' With my notions of inspiration,' he adds in a later letter, ' I am obliged to believe what the inspired apostles taught. . . . With your notions of inspiration you are at liberty to dispute what the inspired apostles taught.' Thus scriptural authority disappears.[4] Take the Incarnation of our Lord as a case in point.

1 *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, ii. § 29.
2 *Vindication of Christ's Divinity*, Query 4.
3 pp. 122 f. 4 pp. 237 f.

Now the evidence for this is so overwhelming that the Unitarians cannot but deny altogether the inspiration of the Gospel writers, 'to give a colour to their wretched cause.' But scriptural inspiration cannot be so lightly brushed aside. 'You will perhaps think it incredible,' suggests Horsley, 'that they, who were assisted by the Divine Spirit when they preached, should be deserted by that Spirit when they committed what they had preached to writing. . . . You will think it unlikely that they, who were led by the Spirit into all truth, should be permitted to lead the whole Church for many ages into error.'[1] If, then, inspiration by the Spirit of God is allowed to be a fact, it must be allowed also as a fact commanding respectful attention—not a slavish attention which excludes reason, yet an attention which, with all the safeguards afforded by scholarship, recognizes that the Voice of God can never properly be confused with the voice of man.

III

Deistic philosophy, which offered to an unfallen humanity a natural religion of reason and morals, naturally denied the truth of revelation in the Christian sense. It is not surprising, therefore, to find certain of its exponents revelling in criticism of the Scriptures, attacking what they believed to be inconsistencies, discrediting the miraculous, and emphasizing their repudiation of the Church's doctrine of inspiration. It may be granted that some of the transcendental school admitted a revelation which directly affects the consciousness, while they declined to accept any form of it which involved 'external' or objective communication. Even this, however, did not mean that the transcendentalists saw the *necessity* for revelation over and above the teaching of natural religion; and it need hardly be said that they, in common with the Deists generally, condemned altogether the idea of a *written* revelation. Butler was anxious to show that the revelation of Scripture is itself not in conflict with the standard of reason. 'If in revelation,' he argues, 'there be found any passages the seeming meaning of which is contrary to natural religion, we may most certainly conclude such seeming meaning not to be the real one. But,'

[1] *Tracts* (*Sermon on the Incarnation*), pp. 367 ff.

he continues, ' it is not any degree of a presumption against an interpretation of Scripture that such interpretation contains a doctrine which the light of nature cannot discover, or a precept which the law of nature does not oblige to.' [1] Human reason must always have its limitations. ' We have no principle of reason upon which to judge beforehand how it were to be expected revelation should have been left. . . . And therefore, neither obscurity, nor seeming inaccuracy of style, nor various readings, nor early disputes about the authors of particular parts, nor any other things of the like kind, though they had been much more considerable in degree than they are, could overthrow the authority of the Scripture. . . . In Scripture we are not competent judges, as we are in common books.' [2] Moreover, it is not enough to realize that reason has its limitations ; it is imperative also that reason, to be reason, must be reasonable. By all means ' let reason be kept to,' says Butler ; ' and if any part of the Scripture account of the redemption of the world by Christ can be shewn to be really contrary to it, let the Scripture, in the name of God, be given up : but let not such poor creatures as we go on objecting against an infinite scheme, that we do not see the necessity or usefulness of all its parts, and call this reasoning.' [3] Reason is rightly prized, for it is ' the candle of the Lord within us (Prov. xx. 27) ' : but, concludes Butler, ' it can afford no light where it does not shine ; nor judge, where it has no principles to judge upon.' [4]

The firm belief in Divine guidance held by Descartes enables us to regard him as approaching to the Christian position in regard to inspiration. To him God is the Source of all truth. This must be so, since our conception of Him as the absolutely perfect Being could not possibly have originated from our own imperfect mind : it must have been imparted by God Himself. On the other hand, even when Spinoza professed theism, he did not hesitate to attack the claims made on behalf of the authority of Scripture, while the pantheistic beliefs which came to be associated with him could not allow him to think of God as revealing Himself to any object *outside of* Himself. He does not deem it inconsistent with this standpoint, however, to assert that it is possible for man to know God by nature, that

[1] *Analogy*, ii. 1.
[2] *Ibid.*, 3.
[3] *Ibid.*, 5.
[4] *Ibid.*, *Conclusion*

is, in and through his own nature. He does not go so far as Malebranche († 1715), who held that it is natural for all persons not only to know God, but also to love Him ; yet he refers to man's love of God as the love wherewith God loves Himself, thus using terminology which the earlier theologians had associated especially with the Holy Spirit. From such a system as Spinoza's, indeed, it would appear impossible to rule out utterly any kind of Divine relation with finite beings, though such relation may have little connexion with revelation. To Leibnitz and Wolff, however, revelation was central.[1]

At the foundation of the British school of philosophy, Francis Bacon, apostle of reason though he was, speaks of the Holy Spirit as 'the Teacher of all truth,'[2] and Berkeley, supported by the American, Jonathan Edwards, proceeded against the succeeding rationalism by declaring that it is only the Higher Intelligence that can arouse conceptions in the mind. In his *New Translation of the Four Gospels* George Campbell expresses his disagreement with the determinism of the current philosophy. Whereas the spirit of error wholly dominates any one's mind and robs him of his freedom, the Spirit of Truth, in influencing the writers of Scripture, permitted them to employ the style and idiom most familiar to them. They remained free agents. 'So far only they were overruled in point of expression by the Divine Spirit, that nothing could be introduced tending in any way to obstruct the intention of the whole.'[3] Campbell felt that there was another consideration involved beside personal liberty. 'Why did the Holy Spirit choose to deliver such important truths in the barbarous idiom of a few obscure Galileans, and not in the politer and more harmonious strains of Greek eloquence ?' he asks. The answer is, 'that it might appear beyond contradiction that the excellency of the power was of God and not of man.'[4] Horsley argues rather differently from the widespread use of the Greek vernacular. Both divines, however, insisted that the writers of the books of the Bible were inspired by the Divine Spirit to set down His thoughts and not their own, and that they were able to distinguish between these 'by means of that lively faith with which the Divine illumination

[1] See the Historical Introduction, p. 40.
[2] *Confession of Faith.*
[3] i. p. 29.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 15.

is accompanied.' [1] The whole subject of inspiration came under the notice of the philosophers of the time, some of the earlier queries, as well as those arising in other contemporary schools of thought, being presented for debate. As has been observed, the subject had become much wider than a testing of the genuineness of written revelation, though points had emerged to make that more complex a subject in itself. But those who defended the cause of Divine revelation surely made good their case, for, in the words of Dr. W. B. Pope, ' there is literally no philosophical argument of any value against the Christian doctrine of a special inspiring influence of the Holy Ghost.' [2]

IV

The various movements associated closely or otherwise with the term ' Mysticism ' were all based on the assumption that God reveals Himself to and inspires the devout mind. This general characteristic, however, includes opinions of differing interpretations and values, so much so that on this one subject of inspiration there were greater divisions between certain of the mystical schools themselves than between certain of them and other movements never regarded as mystical. Quietism emphasized the truth of the direct inspiration of the mind by the Spirit of God, but decried any Divine leading of the Church or of the writers of the Bible. It even laid down as a mark of the genuineness of individual inspiration an assurance that the will of the individual was reduced to impotence. This was just the prescription of Molinos, namely the suppression of the conscious self. Contrary to the principal judgements of Churchmen on the relation of the inspiring Spirit to the human agent, in which the perfect freedom of that agency was clearly affirmed, the Quietist theory thus ruled out, as far as it could, the human element altogether, except as a passive something on which the Holy Spirit could freely make what impressions He willed.

With Quakerism the situation was entirely different. Its doctrine of the ' inner light ' presupposed an illuminating power of the Holy Spirit directly operative on the mind independently of scriptural truth, while in no sense antagonistic to it. Against

1 *New Translation*, i. p. 113. 2 *Compendium of Christian Theology*, i. p. 186.

the background of the theological discussion of the period of the Commonwealth, when many Puritan divines held closely to the belief in ' verbal inspiration,' the preaching of George Fox of the possibility of the Lord's inward voice being heard by every man came as a refreshing breeze. Not, however, that Fox thought little of the inspiration of the Scriptures. He knew his Bible better than most people of learning knew it, and would have been one of the last to have ever undervalued it. Barclay, too, laid great stress on the inspiration of Scripture, both his *Confession* and his *Catechism* being composed almost entirely of Scripture quotations. In his *Apology for the True Christian Divinity* he asserts that ' because the Spirit of God is the Fountain of all truth and sound reason, . . . it cannot contradict either the outward testimony of the Scripture, or right and sound reason.' [1] The Spirit vouchsafes a present witness to Scriptural truth,[2] which itself furnishes a corrective to His inner revelations in the sense that nothing contrary to it is attributable to the guidance of the Spirit.[3] God has always revealed Himself, by His Spirit, to His children, and accordingly has spoken to them, by that same Spirit, in the Scriptures. But, after all this is said, the indwelling Spirit must not be regarded as confining His messages to the Scriptures as though they were His one and only medium, ' because there are many truths which . . . are in no wise to be found in the Scripture. Besides, . . . the Spirit doth not only subjectively help us to discern truths elsewhere delivered, but also objectively presents those truths to our minds.' ' Since Christ hath provided for us so good an instructor, why need we then lean so much to those traditions and commandments of men, wherewith so many Christians have burdened themselves? . . . The Spirit of God dwelleth in every true Christian; therefore it leadeth, instructeth, and teacheth every true Christian whatsoever is needful for him to know.' And though much more may be said on behalf of the inspiration of Scripture than on behalf of the traditions and commandments of the Church referred to, ' it will not follow that these Divine revelations ' of the Spirit to the individual ' are to be subjected to the test either of the outward testimony of the Scriptures or of the natural reason

[1] Prop. 2. [2] Prop. 3.
[3] Prop. 10. Cp. his *Catechism*, chap. ii.

of man.'[1] The Scripture declares that the Holy Spirit is 'the first and principal leader' into all truth rather than itself, for 'the principal fountain of truth must be the truth itself, that is, that whose certainty and authority depend not upon another.'[2] There is undoubtedly great truth in such teaching, for it is on record that the Spirit of truth has been given to guide men into all the truth (John xiv. 16, 17, 25) and to tell them truths which at an earlier stage they could not bear (John xvi. 12 ff.). But there is danger lest the overemphasis of the subjective side of such teaching should throw out of due proportion other New Testament teaching concerning the Atonement, the Church, and the Sacraments, which are equally important to all who profess and call themselves Christians. As regards a right understanding of the Scriptures, Barclay, we may recall, names the guidance of the Holy Spirit as the first essential, and by means of this, he declares, an unlettered man can understand more than can another who employs merely 'his own industry, learning, and knowledge in the languages.'[3] To some degree, this statement supports a very similar view of Owen's as against its criticism by Clagett; and there is undoubtedly a 'witness of the Spirit' by which the devout seeker recognizes the Divine and is predisposed toward it. Once again we are reminded of the truth that spiritual things must be spiritually discerned, but there should be no suggestion of discouragement of learning in any of its branches when applied to the Word of God; for learning is also due to the guidance of the Spirit, and often affords very necessary enlightenment to the most earnest of the saints. Yet, accepting the principle just stated as with a balanced mind, we may agree with Otto's observation that 'there is no harm even in the fact that the records of Christ's life are fragmentary, that they contain manifold uncertainties, that they are intermingled with legendary and overlaid with Hellenistic elements. For the Spirit knows and recognizes what is of the Spirit.'[4]

Swedenborg held that Scripture was written by God, who, though He used human minds for the immediate purpose, gave therein eternal truths for all men in all ages. Origen

[1] Prop. 2.
[2] Prop. 3.
[3] Prop. 10.
[4] *Idea of the Holy*, p. 166.

had spoken of a hidden meaning or secret spiritual interpretation of all Scripture, and now Swedenborg expressed belief in a spiritual meaning of, or a spiritual fact underlying, every fact recorded in it, and even every word.[1] In the inner power of the Divine Word, so he taught, Christ was now making His Second Advent. The best known forerunner of Pietism in Germany, Jakob Boehme, emphasized the necessity of a passive mind for the reception of truth as revealed by the Spirit. Like the Quakers, he professed a direct illumination from the Spirit, a unique spiritual insight into Divine mysteries; and he held that, in order that such illumination should be granted to any one, there must be assumed the understanding of the re-born soul, rather than reason, as ordinarily understood.[2] Those who do possess this illumination, and are therefore 'children of light,' have within them the Holy Spirit moving and reigning and teaching them all things.[3] This kind of inspiration is decidedly individualistic; yet, when Pietism actually took shape as a movement, it proved itself to be very largely a scriptural revival, becoming in Germany much as Methodism became in England—a revival to spread 'scriptural holiness.' Spener, the real leader of the movement, was noted for his Biblical scholarship, as also were Müller, his predecessor, and his successors Francke, Lange, and Bengel. Indeed, later Pietism seems to have swung to the other extreme, and to have discouraged any search for truth apart from the Scriptures.

In the year 1786 Wesley, in referring to the Methodists, asks: 'What is their fundamental doctrine?' and answers, 'That the Bible is the whole and sole rule of Christian faith and practice.' This is a statement which explains his outlook on other subjects. The force of it is abundantly clear from the Evangelical Revival itself.

In conclusion, it should be remembered that in the present as in the past the Holy Spirit is the infallible guide to truth, whether through the written Word, or in regard to the Church which is Christ's Body, or in regard to individuals who are prepared in spirit while not being asked by the same Word of

[1] Suggestive of the symbolism of the Cabbalists. See Inge, *Christian Mysticism* (5th ed.), p. 270 *n.*

[2] See Erdmann, *History of Philosophy*, i. p. 581.

[3] *Aurora*, § 3.

God to submerge their personality or to abandon their reason. The authority of Divine inspiration is no less true because it is often imparted through human channels: indeed, the test of such authority would seem to be whether or not it is true. The standards by which truth in turn may be tested have been touched upon by certain of our writers, but one of the surest was that so fervently upheld by the sanest 'Mystics,' namely, in Pauline terminology, 'He that is spiritual judgeth all things' (1 Cor. ii. 15). There is undoubtedly a definite appeal made by inherent truth to the consciousness, but the consciousness in question must be 'spiritual,' and must not ignore either its own reasoning faculty or the spiritual judgement of others who are like minded. If, however, this be accepted as the general rule, some exceptions will have to be recognized, as the transformation of character, even in the case of semi-civilized people, brought about through the mere reading of the Scriptures.[1] The same has held good of others for the most part outside the reach of ordinary Christian influences, such as imprisoned criminals. The Bible may thus be said to have a wonderful 'power of its own,' though this is simply a popular way of regarding it as in an especial sense the Word of God, and employed as such by the Spirit of God. Further than this, we must always thankfully acknowledge that the Spirit strives in the hearts of all men, often leading them by an authority which they do not acknowledge. But in attempting to formulate any general rule relating to spiritual authority we must not forget that allowance must be made for development, a term which embraces the revelation of new truths as well as the application of old truths in new ways. Such development is of the nature of an 'epigenesis' which points to dependence on environment for its progress, much in the sense in which the oak is not only in the acorn but also in the action upon it of chemicals in soil, water, and air. This may readily be acknowledged in the case of development of doctrine, where so much enters in from a growing world of thought and need to deepen and enlarge the deposit of truth. This is not to say, however, that a warning is unnecessary to guard against unnatural accretions which

[1] See the reports of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and of various Missionary Societies.

cannot properly be regarded as evolved from the inner substance itself.[1]

In a wide sense, it is always through human nature that Divine inspiration comes. God must be found within before He can be found without, and before the former discovery can take place it would seem that He must first be presented with something by us before He can put His Breath into it. Centuries before the scope of our present study this had been grasped by theologians, who returned time after time to explore as best they could the relationship of the Divine Messenger to the human medium; but now there appeared a general movement, appreciative of what psychology was beginning to teach, and eager to follow where this new science would lead. Only in comparatively recent years, however, has psychology led theology any appreciable distance towards a fuller understanding of the above relationship; and, bearing on this, 'the greatest recent discovery,' in Dr. Gardner's words, 'is undoubtedly that of the unconscious element in the human mind,'[2] or, perhaps better, the subconscious element, the 'regions below manifest consciousness,' where, as Dr. Barnes, Bishop of Birmingham, has remarked, we may well have intercourse with the Holy Spirit. Dr. Gardner quotes from F. W. H. Myers's studies of the subliminal consciousness in his *Human Personality* the statement that 'the most precious knowledge comes to us . . . through eminently subliminal processes.'[3] This may possibly be regarded as due to auto-suggestion on the part of the subconscious, prompted and then used by the Spirit. It would be wiser, however, to avoid the use of the term 'auto-suggestion' in this connexion, if full justice is to be done to the work of the Spirit as of One who completely pervades the whole self; for, as Prof. E. S. Waterhouse has pointed out, we cannot *psychologically* dispense with the operation of the Spirit on

1 Cf. Otto, *Idea of the Holy*, pp. 44, 119, 169.

2 *The Practical Basis of Christian Belief*, p. 15.

3 Dr. Emmet (in *The Spirit*, etc., pp. 210 ff.) instances dreams, with their 'sense of that mysterious authority.' He suggests that the 'superhuman spontaneity' in the mind of the prophets might have been prepared by an unconscious process. Cp. how, in the case of great musical compositions, the succeeding notes of the main theme follow often according to expectation. Somewhat suggestive on the subject of the subconscious generally are the experiments in thought-transference carried out in 1924 by Lord Balfour and Prof. Gilbert Murray.

the human mind. No ' uprush ' from the subliminal consciousness explained psychologically under this head can be conceived apart from the direct control of the Spirit.[1] Also it should not be overlooked that inspiration is a heightening of the conscious, the raising of the mind to the full powers latent within it, and more, the accession of spiritual power to the whole personality. John the Baptist was one of the last men who ever could be a merely instrumental ' voice,' in spite of his own testimony.

[1] See William James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, p. 242.

IX

THE WORK OF THE SPIRIT IN THE INCARNATION

'Cum ergo Patris ingeniti, et Filii eius unigeniti, et amborum doni simulque hominis hoc dono concepti et sanctificati, atque in unam personam Trinitatis assumpti sit una Divinitas, qua et Pater Deus, et Filius Deus, et Spiritus sanctus Deus, et Spiritu sancto conceptus homo Deus nominatur, recte de his omnibus una aequalitas praedicatur, quorum una divinitatis essentia, vel natura cognoscitur et virtus eadem.'—GERHOHUS.

IX

THE WORK OF THE SPIRIT IN THE INCARNATION

I

The work of the Spirit in the Incarnation of the eternal Son of God, as taught by the Church, rests on the fact that 'the Spirit is the inner essence and element of the life of God as Father and as Son, and the energy and influence of God in both aspects of the Divine Life.'[1] Its basis is therefore the doctrines of the Trinity and the Divinity of Christ, and the differences of view on this subject which appear within these two centuries arise almost altogether from differences on the others. Some Eastern Churchmen, as well as some Western, believed that the Incarnation was not due to the existence of sin in the human race; and that, if it was not entirely exemplary, it was certainly not mainly redemptive in its purpose. The Church in general, however, did not adopt such opinions, since they were held to rest on no solid scriptural foundation. Difference of view arose concerning the manner of Christ's sinlessness amid earthly conditions, though this was relatively of minor account. The *Formula of Concord* declares that, whereas original sin is passed on from one generation to another in accordance with the laws of heredity, Jesus, by virtue of His supernatural conception by the Holy Spirit, was free from original sin; and the *Confession of the Remonstrants* speaks of all people, on account of Adam's sin, as deprived through heredity of heavenly happiness, and inclined to commit evil, Jesus Christ being the sole exception. Hence the general opinion of Protestant divines at that time was that the sinlessness of our Lord on earth was due to His supernatural conception by the Holy Spirit, the word 'sinlessness' also excluding original sin; and in this they followed Gerhohus and other divines of the Mediaeval Church. Roman Catholicism held that Christ's

[1] W. L. Walker, *The Spirit and the Incarnation*, p. 238.

freedom from original sin was due to a similar freedom wrought for the Virgin Mary by the Holy Spirit at the Annunciation.[1] John Huss had been likewise convinced.

Saumur theology was no exception to the general recognition of the supernatural character of the birth of Christ, and of the part taken in it by the Holy Spirit. Indeed, Cameron refers to the Holy Spirit as the Spirit of Christ as if he were dealing not with two designations of the same eternal Being, but with an identity which the Incarnation alone could warrant.[2] The Mediaeval Church, without putting such a construction on the term 'Spirit of Christ,' had definitely taught that the whole Deity became incarnate, though only in the Person of the Son; and Hooker confirmed this by asserting that 'incarnation may neither be granted to any Person but only one, nor yet denied to that Nature which is common unto all Three.'[3]

In meeting Socinian attacks Owen followed the lead of his predecessors in the way in which he makes reference to this subject. It was the Spirit of God whose particular office it was to guide the incarnate Lord. He is 'the immediate operator of all Divine acts of the Son Himself, even on His own human nature'; [4] which would be in accord with expectation, since 'the miraculous conception of the body of Christ . . . was the peculiar and especial work of the Holy Ghost.'[5] This is not to say that the Holy Spirit is the Father of the Son: He was only the Creator of His earthly body. Yet the human nature of Christ was real,[6] and sanctified by the Holy Spirit at the moment of its conception, thereby being

1 Note the great Franciscan, Wadding (1588–1657), who published in 1624 a history of the controversy concerning the Virgin Birth, and, in 1655, his *Immaculatae Conceptionis Virginis Mariae Opusculum*. See also the Bull *Ineffabilis* of Pope Pius IX (December 8, 1854). Similarly the Greek Church, though it extended the Western doctrine to impeccability.

2 *Sermon* on John vi. 61, 62. Cp. Moberly, *Atonement and Personality*: 'The Holy Ghost in particular is, to us, immediately, the Spirit of the Incarnate Christ, made, through the Incarnation, the Spirit of Man' (p. 203). He quotes Acts xvi. 7; 2 Cor. iii. 17 f.; Gal. iv. 6; Phil. i. 19; Rom. viii. 9–11; 1 Pet. i. 10, 11. But this assertion hardly suits his own belief that the Divine Unity is intensified by the revelation of the internal Divine relations, for the statement that the Spirit of God is become the Spirit of Man introduces that 'otherness' against which Christian philosophers constantly fought.

3 *Ecclesiastical Polity*, v. chap. li, § 2. So *Westminster Conf.*, viii. § 2.

4 *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, p. 180.

5 *Ibid.*, p. 181.

6 *Ibid.*, pp. 183 ff.

free from all hereditary taint (Luke i. 35; Heb. vii. 26).[1] Christ's 'growth in grace and wisdom was the peculiar work of the Holy Spirit,'[2] who later on was the source of the powers and gifts which characterized the Lord's earthly ministry.[3] Then when Christ offered Himself for our Atonement, He did so in and through the Holy Spirit, and when His body lay in the tomb it was by the Holy Spirit that it was preserved from decay.[4] Christ's resurrection was effected by the Father through the power of the Spirit,[5] and through that same power was His resurrection-body afterwards glorified.[6]

It was inevitable that so close a connexion between the Incarnation and the operation of the Divine Spirit should be included in the debate on the doctrine of the Trinity initiated by Sherlock. Manifestly there was a tritheistic danger in his teaching: on the other hand, this was at times distinctly exaggerated by the followers of South. Correspondingly we read exaggerated replies on behalf of the followers of Sherlock, and, in *The Distinction between Real and Nominal Trinitarians*, the apologist for the Dean was inclined to overreach himself in some of his criticisms. 'This Catholic faith of the Incarnation,' he writes, 'which is so often and so expressly owned by this Council [the sixth General], is utterly irreconcilable with this Sabellian unity of the Divine Nature and Substance, without running into the Patripassian heresy that the whole Trinity is incarnate. For if Christ in one Person hath two Natures . . . and consequently two distinct wills; . . . either, as God, He must be distinct in Nature and Person from the Father and the Holy Ghost; or, if all three Persons of the Trinity are but one single solitary Nature, and consequently but one true and proper Person, all Three . . . must be incarnate and suffer in the Incarnation and sufferings of Christ, which the Catholic Church condemned as heresy.'[7] Already Sherlock had replied to South saying that to affirm that the Godhead is one 'single' Nature is to adopt the Sabellian standpoint, and to be forced to admit that the whole Trinity must have been incarnated; Patripassianism would therefore surely result. Firstly, it is clear that Sabellianism is not necessarily involved

1 *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, pp. 188 f.
2 *Ibid.*, p. 190.
3 *Ibid.*, pp. 191 ff.
4 *Ibid.*, pp. 202 f.
5 *Ibid.*, p. 204.
6 *Ibid.*, p. 206.
7 Chap. iii.

by an affirmation of the singularity or simplicity of the Divine Nature. Debaters did not always grasp the significance of the terms used by one another, for, as Howe observes, the term *simplex*, attributed to the Divine Unity by the Schoolmen, had led to some very confused thinking. Secondly, Sherlock's argument suggests that the charge of Patripassianism might equally have been made against his own position, because, as he himself asserted, mutual consciousness must involve mutual sensation, if it is a real consciousness at all. Limited to one Person of the Trinity—the Son—the experience of Incarnation, as Hooker said, may not be denied to the Divine Nature which is common to all Three ; and this proper distinction between Person and Nature safely prevents any just accusation of the above-mentioned heresy. In stating that mutuality of sensation follows mutuality of consciousness, Sherlock evidently had principally in mind the unity of the *Nature*, thus maintaining the aforesaid distinction. Since, then, South clearly maintained it also, the charge preferred against him of falling into the Patripassian error was as unwarranted as a similar charge would have been against his opponent.

The Unitarian offensive as delivered by Clarke was at times very plausible, and therefore all the more dangerous. A passing reference of his to the Incarnation has about it, at first sight, all the appearance of orthodoxy. ' The Holy Spirit,' he writes, ' is described in the New Testament as the immediate Author and Worker of all miracles, even of those done by our Lord Himself ; and as the Conductor of Christ in all the actions of His life during His state of humiliation here upon earth.' [1] But John Edwards unmasks him. ' The Doctor,' he observes, ' having hitherto done all he could to destroy the Divinity of Christ, now proceeds to baffle that of the Holy Ghost. This is his present design, but first he observes that the Divine Nature of Christ did so far diminish itself, that then, during the time of His Incarnation, He was all along under the conduct of the Holy Spirit. A gross and wilful mistake, and an invention of the Doctor's own !—Only to subvert the Divinity of Christ, for it was only as He was Man, and as He was to discharge some offices of a Mediator, that He

[1] *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, ii. § 28.

was under the conduct of the Spirit.'[1] Here, indeed, was another distinction to be remembered. Priestley's attack, however, was of a bolder kind. He insists that the simple humanity of Christ, and, in some quarters, the belief that Joseph was as truly His parent as was Mary, were features of the creed of the primitive Church, and so were not then regarded as heretical. The Divinity of Christ, he holds, was an idea introduced by later 'Christian philosophers,' who personified the Logos and connected it with Christ. Thus the Logos came to be represented 'as an intelligent principle, or being, distinct from God, though an emanation from Him. This doctrine was but too convenient for those who wished to recommend the religion of Christ. Accordingly, they immediately fixed upon this Logos as the intelligence which either animated the body of Christ, or which was in some inexplicable manner united to His soul.'[2] It is plain that, when thinking of the Incarnation, Tertullian also confused the Logos with the Holy Spirit.[3] Further, the doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ, which this union with the Logos encouraged, 'favours that of the pre-existence of all human souls—a doctrine which has no countenance in reason or revelation. It has staggered many, when they reflect coolly upon the subject, to think that so exalted a being as this, an "unique" in the creation, a being next in dignity and intelligence to God Himself, possessed of powers absolutely incomprehensible by us, should inhabit this particular spot in the universe, in preference to any other in the whole extent of perhaps a boundless creation.'[4] So spake the scientist and Fellow of the Royal Society. The thought is still as staggering as ever. 'Truth is stranger than fiction.'

In meeting these objections, Horsley first of all refers Priestley to the first Epistle of St. John for 'the doctrine of a true and proper Incarnation.' 'The Apostle,' he says, 'makes the acknowledgment of the Incarnation, in which both an antecedent Divinity and an assumed humanity are implied. . . . And in the positive assertion of the Incarnation, and the express censure of the opposite doctrine as antichristian, he reprobates the notion of Christ's mere humanity. . . .

[1] *Animadversions on Dr. Clarke's Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, chap. iii.
[2] *History of the Corruptions of Christianity*, i. pp. 29 ff.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 92.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 143.

It appears, therefore,' Horsley continues, 'that to confess that "Jesus Christ is come in the flesh" (1 John iv. 2), and to affirm that Jesus Christ is truly a man, are propositions not perfectly equivalent. Dr. Priestley, indeed, hath shewn himself very sensible of the difference. . . . For the words, "Jesus Christ is come *in* the flesh," Dr. Priestley substitutes these, "Jesus Christ is come *of* the flesh," . . . two very distinct propositions. The one affirms an Incarnation, the other a mortal extraction. The first is St. John's assertion: the second is Dr. Priestley's.'[1] There is no doubt in Horsley's mind but that St. John in the above text postulates the pre-existence of Christ, and regards His Incarnation by the Holy Spirit as one of the outstanding proofs of His Divinity.[2] 'To affirm, as the truth is, that Christ was begotten of Mary by the Holy Ghost, in Epiphanius' sense of those words, was to affirm much more than the miraculous conception in any sense in which a Unitarian might affirm it. It was to affirm our Lord's Divinity.'[3] What is wrong with Priestley's argument, observes Horsley, is that it is built up on his 'notion of the mere materiality of man';[4] and the trouble he takes to build it up is further evidence of his misguided intellect, for 'a reason why a man should be a man one would not expect to find in a sober man's discourse.'[5]

The next point which Horsley discusses is the allegation made by Priestley with regard to the Logos. He quotes Ignatius to show the untruth of this, and the truth that the generation of the Son was an 'utterance' of the eternal Word, 'the eternal Logos of the Paternal Mind.'[6] Indeed, the general testimony of the Fathers is 'that the personal subsistence of a Divine Logos is implied in the very idea of a God.' It is this which is the testimony of the primitive Church.[7] Horsley considers at great length the question of the influence of Platonism in the Church at that early period, which his opponent had raised. According to Priestley, the 'Platonizing Christians' held that the Logos was only a property of the Divine Mind, which assumed a separate personal character in time. 'Be pleased, Sir,' rejoins Horsley, 'to

1 *Tracts in Controversy with Dr. Priestley* (*A Charge to the Clergy*), pp. 18 f.
2 *Tracts* (*Letter IV*), pp. 118 ff.
3 *Ibid.*, pp. 160 f.
4 *Ibid.*, p. 126.
5 *Ibid.*, p. 127.
6 *Tracts* (*A Charge to the Clergy*), pp. 21 f.
7 *Ibid.*, p. 61.

explain the difference between this conversion of attribute into substance, or property into person, and a creation out of nothing.'[1] Such a notion, he remarks, is Priestley's imagination, not the meaning of the 'Platonic Fathers.'[2] These men never conceived of the generation of the Son as marking the beginning of His existence, but rather as 'a display of His powers.' The doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ, the Son of God, cannot therefore 'favour that of the pre-existence of all human souls,' for Deity stands apart from created beings where infinite things such as this are concerned. The latter doctrine, therefore, in having 'no countenance in reason or revelation,' does not affect the former, which, in point of fact, is countenanced by both.[3]

Finally, Horsley takes up the statement of Priestley that one can disbelieve in the Incarnation 'without any impeachment of his faith or character as a Christian.' This is truly, he says, an 'extraordinary opinion.'[4] On the contrary, belief in the Incarnation is too deeply embedded in the Christian creed to be so easily torn out and cast aside. What is the witness of the New Testament still further? Only the Incarnation could have accounted for so special an inspiration of the Holy Spirit afforded to Christ in so remarkable a manner (Heb. i. 1, 2), for He is greater than prophets or angels (Heb. i. 3–6, 8).[5] Only this, again, could have brought it about that 'infirmity and perfection should thus meet in the same Person.'[6] Manifestly, then, 'union with the Divine Nature could not have been the principle of an existence physically derived from Adam.'[7] Christ's birth was not subject to the ordinary laws of heredity: He was free from the taint of original sin. This does not mean that it was impossible for Him to sin, even had He ever the desire. It means that original tendencies to sin did not exist in Him, also that His powers of resisting evil were greater than those possessed by the human race. On the other hand, His temptations were correspondingly greater, and the sinlessness of Christ, for the very reason alone that His humanity was real, was due to conquest, not to inability. Moreover, any one tainted with original sin

[1] *Tracts*, (*Letters*), pp. 255 f.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 260.
[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 262, 266.
[4] *Ibid.* (*Sermon on the Incarnation*, Christmas Day, 1785), p. 353.
[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 354 f.
[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 358 f.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 359.

would be 'incapable of becoming a mediator for his brethren.' No sinful man purified by the Holy Spirit could have been such a mediator, for the purification itself is entirely dependent on 'the propitiation which hath been made for us.' Since, then, the Redeemer of the world could not have been one 'of the contaminated race,' it was necessary 'that the manner of His conception should be supernatural.'[1] These very things are recorded in the Scriptures, the testimony of which must be accepted as authentic. For it would be difficult to refute the authority of Matthew, one of the Twelve, whose Gospel was 'written at a time when many of the near relations of the Holy Family must have been living, by whom the story, had it been false, had been easily confuted'; or that of Luke, who wrote 'for the express purpose of furnishing a summary of authentic facts,'[2] and who testified that these facts were 'part of the earliest catechetical instruction (Luke i. 4), a part of the catechism, no doubt, which St. Paul's converts learned of the Apostle.'[3] Horsley thus brings together the witness of the New Testament, that of the Early Church, and that of 'Christian reason,' to support the doctrine of the Incarnation of the eternal Son of God. To him it was amazing that the Unitarians should deny the miraculous conception of Christ and advocate His mere humanity in view of the utter sinlessness of His character, which so clearly gives Him a unique position of His own. In what other way than by the Incarnation, as revealed in Holy Writ and taught by the Church through all the ages, could there ever have been brought good tidings of great joy, which should be to all people?

II

It may be right to say that the genius of Mysticism regarded the Incarnation as, in a manner, but an expression of the immanence of the transcendent Deity. When, however, the question is asked in what manner this may be said to be, various movements here considered under this head provide various answers. Quakerism holds that the incarnate Lord possessed, in addition to His outward and fleshly body, an inner and spiritual one. 'As there was the outward and visible

[1] *Tracts* (*Sermon on the Incarnation*, Christmas Day, 1785), pp. 360 ff.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 365. [3] *Ibid.*, pp. 366 f.

body and temple of Jesus Christ, which took its origin from the Virgin Mary, there is also,' writes Barclay, 'the spiritual body of Christ, by and through which He that was "the Word in the beginning with God," and was and is God, did reveal Himself to the sons of men in all ages.'[1] In Swedenborgian teaching, Christ's humanity is held to be ideally pre-existent, being now made manifest in the flesh by the agency of the Holy Spirit: in other words, God, pre-existing before the Incarnation as ideal Man, simply appeared in a temporary physical manner, taking upon Himself a material body through the Virgin. Since God has been eternally God-Man, the Incarnation, in the sense in which God *became* Man, is denied.[2] This, it is claimed, is a doctrine of the Incarnation which involves no 'kenosis,' because the incarnate God was in no way self-limited except by His human form, all His infinite power being retained. The humanity which He assumed was really human, being subject to temptation and other trials, but it was gradually 'glorified' by the Divinity residing within it.

It may be added that Methodism was fully in line with the main teaching of the Catholic Church on this subject. 'The Methodists believe that Jesus Christ is strictly and properly God, and at the same time man; and that He was incarnate by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.'[3] Methodist theology has also emphasized the unity of the Divine Nature in the Incarnation of the second Person of the Trinity,[4] thus supporting what earlier divines have been urging within the limits of this chapter. This is not lost sight of in the hymns of Charles Wesley:

> Thy glorious Name and Nature's powers
> Thou dost to us make known;
> And all the Deity is ours
> Through Thy incarnate Son.

1 *An Apology for the True Christian Divinity*, prop. 13.

2 See Swedenborg's *Divine Love and Wisdom*. 'God from eternity, the one Divine Being, embracing in Himself the trinity of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, came into the world, we are taught for our redemption. . . . The Father was in Jesus, as the soul of a man is in his body; and the Holy Spirit was from Him, as the breath of a man is from his body.'—H. G. Drummond, *New Church Manual*, p. 12.

3 Jonathan Crowther, *History of the Wesleyan Methodists*, p. 175.

4 'It was not an Atonement offered to one Person in the Trinity by Another, and witnessed by a Third. The Son Incarnate came to do the will of God: His own will, and the will of the Holy Ghost, as much as the will of the Father.'—W. B. Pope, *Compendium*, ii. p. 102.

Here was an emphasis which, as has been observed, had found expression in the Church for centuries previously, though not always with such intense personal feeling. How, then, could the Incarnate Son, really human though He was, be other than free from the sinful tendencies inherent in the race He had come to purchase with His own blood? All this is precisely what is suggested by the evidence of the New Testament, and it affords the only reasonable explanation of the Person of Christ.

X

THE MISSION OF THE SPIRIT

'The purpose of the Incarnation was to reveal the Father. . . . The purpose of the mission of the Comforter was to reveal the Son.'—W. R. Inge.

'Non quod antea Spiritus sanctus non esset in cordibus discipulorum, vel etiam in antiquorum sanctorum, sed manifesta plenitudine ante sic non fuit datus, quomodo post ascensionem die decima in centum viginti nomina transmissus legitur.'—Alcuin.

X

THE MISSION OF THE SPIRIT

I

Consistently with the belief that the Incarnation affected the whole Divine Nature, while only the second Person of the Trinity became incarnate, the Mediaeval Church declared that the Mission of the Spirit also affects it, while only the third Person of the Trinity may now be said to be sent. The same unity of the Divine Substance and Will that compelled the first conclusion, compelled the second, so that, in the Mission of the Spirit, the Father and the Son, together with the Spirit of Them Both, are everywhere present, working toward the perfection of the created order, and, particularly, the salvation and sanctification of humanity. With reference to the personal distinctions within this Divine Unity, it came to be held by mediaeval theologians in the West that the Spirit is sent equally and simultaneously by the Father and the Son as from one Source. Not all believers in the *Filioque*, however, cared to apply the word 'equally' to the Mission of the Spirit, as they did to the Procession of the Spirit, Peter the Lombard, for instance, regarding the initiative in sending Him as taken by the Father, and now Arminius regarding it as taken by the Son.[1] The emphasis varied largely according to the religious outlook of the writers concerned.

In this period the majority of English divines treated the subject in a homiletic, then in a systematic manner, the former drifting into the latter as the theological horizon darkened with controversy. Andrewes points out the necessity for the Spirit's Mission in the course of his *Sermons on the Holy Spirit*, in which, too, the necessity for the human response to it is just as earnestly affirmed. 'These three, Prayer, the Word, the Sacraments, be every one of them as an artery to convey the Spirit into us.'[2] That He will assuredly own such means

[1] *Thesis VI, de Sp. sanct.*, § 3.

[2] *Sermon* 1 (Acts ii. 1–4).

of grace and enter the heart which invites Him is clear from the fact that He has been sent to do this by both the Father and the Son. 'Finding the Father giving here, and the Son giving there,' continues Andrewes, 'we have the proceeding of the Holy Ghost from Both. . . . "Whom the Father shall send," in the twenty-sixth of this [John xiv. 26]; . . . "Whom I will send," in the twenty-sixth of the next [John xv. 26]. Called, therefore, "the Spirit of the Father," and again called "the Spirit of the Son," the Spirit of Both, as sent and proceeding from Both.'[1] The application of this is that 'if the Holy Ghost come not, Christ's coming can do us no good. . . . The exchange is not perfect, unless as Christ taketh our flesh, so He give us His Spirit; as He carrieth up that to heaven, so He send this down into earth.'[2] 'For though Christ have done all that He had to do, all is not done that is to do till the Spirit come too. . . . When all is done, if this be not, nothing is done.' When, however, the Spirit does come, we are aware of this by His 'stirring up in us spiritual motions, holy purposes and desires: specially if they do not vanish again.'[3] Thus it is that we become filled with love, since 'love is the proper attribute and proper effect of the Spirit.'[4] Likewise, adds Cartwright, 'it is evidence of peace accepted by men, if they are breathed upon by the Holy Spirit. . . . Those, therefore, who are flesh, and are not filled (*perfunduntur*) with the Holy Spirit, have no peace with God.'[5] Similar thoughts are found in Donne's *Sermons*. The Holy Spirit is universal in His operations, in space and in time. He is with us always and in every condition of ours, asleep or awake, perfecting in us the work of Christ. There was a time, says Donne, when the Father alone sent the Spirit, for while the Son lived amid human conditions He meekly ascribed all power to the Father. After those human conditions ceased for Him, 'the Holy Ghost was sent by Them Both, Father and Son. But not so as that He was subject to a joint command of Both, or to a diverse command of Either, or that He came unwillingly, or had not a hand even in His own sending. But, howsoever He were perfect God, and had always an absolute power in Himself, and had ever a desire to assist the salvation

[1] *Sermon* 3 (John xiv. 15, 16).
[2] *Sermon* 4 (John xvi. 7).
[3] *Sermon* 13 (1 John v. 6).
[4] *Sermon* 14 (James i. 16, 17).
[5] *Harmonia Evangelica* (John xx. 22).

of man, yet He submitted Himself to the order of the decree.'[1] Having thus been sent, He manifested Himself especially as a Divine Teacher, teaching through the memory and through the ministry of the Church, and applying in these ways Christ's merits to the soul.[2] Moreover, in times of sorrow, He is the only true Comforter, because He is Comfort itself.[3] In fact, the Spirit of God is given that He may become the great factor in every possible human relationship.[4] In his *Sermon* on 'The Spirit's Conviction of Sin,' Peter Sterry follows the same course, emphasizing how in the Spirit the whole Godhead is present to comfort and to strengthen. 'The Spirit,' he says, 'brings Christ for a Comfort along with Him. Christ was to live again in the Spirit (1 Pet. iii. 18). . . . Yea, this Comfort was to be *doubled* at the coming of the Spirit. For the Father was to come along with His dear Son (John xiv. 23). . . . The Spirit was to be the chariot for the other Two. . . . Thus the Father, Son, Spirit, and a saint dwell all together, and converse: the Father and Son in the Spirit, the Spirit in our hearts. This is that unity of the Spirit which is the bond of comforts (Eph. iv. 3).'[5] The saints, therefore, need not fear the prince of this world, who has already received judgement (John xvi. 11). 'The Spirit should read this lecture upon the world,' Sterry concludes: 'how, since the Fall, the whole frame, all appearances of things, had been one great enchantment raised and maintained upon the spirits of men by the father of lies, the prince of darkness, to hide their eyes from the sight of God. But how Jesus Christ had by His death cast down that old magician from his throne and power; and now the whole enchantment, the fashion or show of this world, was dissolving and vanishing, till it should appear no more.'[6] That this is being accomplished is due to the mission and operation of the Holy Spirit. It should, then, be at least clear, especially to Christians, that the Spirit of God pervades the universe, remarks Cudworth; for even Seneca described God as 'a Divine Spirit, diffused through all things, whether smallest or greatest, with equal intention.'[7] If, however, He is also diffused throughout the soul, creating that unity with

1 *Sermon* 28 (John xiv. 26). 2 *Sermon* 29 (do.).
3 *Sermon* 31 (Gen. i. 2). 4 *Sermon* 29. 5 p. 6. 6 p. 8.
7 *True Intellectual System of the Universe*, iv. 33 (vol. ii. p. 241).

the Father and the Son already mentioned, it will be fortified against the assaults of evil and led into all the truth. The Christian soul, nevertheless, with all its good intentions, does not always respond to such leading as it should. 'That the Apostles themselves, even after the sending of the Holy Ghost, were, and through inadvertence or prejudice continued for a time, in an error repugnant to a revealed truth, it is unanswerably evident,' observes Chillingworth, 'from the story of the Acts of the Apostles. For notwithstanding our Saviour's express warrant and injunction "to go and preach to all nations," yet until St. Peter was better informed by a vision from heaven, and by the conversion of Cornelius, both he and the rest of the Church held it unlawful for them to go or preach the Gospel to any but the Jews.'[1] The Mission of the Spirit is a teaching Mission, and one not without its disappointments to the Teacher, nor, we trust, without its encouragements.

II

Defenders of the Trinitarian faith, through the whole of the controversy concerning the Trinity, were not so absorbed in discussions of the Being of the Spirit as to ignore the subject of His Mission. 'Whatever God works in us and upon us,' writes Owen, 'He doth it by His Spirit,'[2] who is of 'a pure, spiritual, immaterial nature,' and 'not confined unto any place.'[3] Indeed, 'the Lord Jesus Christ, being ascended unto His Father, hath committed His whole affairs in the Church and in the world unto the Holy Spirit (John xvi. 7–11).'[4] The mission of the Holy Spirit, who is omnipresent, cannot, of course, be any 'local motion,' nor can it imply any sending against His will. It is a term used to denote the undertaking of special work by Him as by One who, though truly sent, is entirely 'a voluntary agent.'[5] The Holy Spirit, then, 'is promised and given as the sole Cause and Author of all the good that, in this world, we are or can be made partakers of.'[6] The Old Testament shows how, in equipping persons for certain tasks, He 'improved' their

[1] *Religion of Protestants*, iii. 31.
[2] *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, p. 15.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 48.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 36.
Ibid., pp. 118 f.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 174.

natural faculties.[1] But there is naturally a much fuller ministry which He exercises in attending the Gospel.[2] In Him we pray to the Father,[3] and from Him we receive teaching which is founded on the ever-fresh teaching of Christ.[4] Only be it remembered, adds Owen, that the free gift of the Holy Spirit can be granted only to those who allow themselves to be prepared beforehand by Himself (John xiv. 17).[5] Here Clagett is in general agreement with Owen, though he is of the opinion that 'giving the Spirit' means 'giving good things' of which the Spirit is the Source, and not the giving of His Person, as Owen interprets it.[6] 'We pray for the Holy Spirit,' he says, 'when we pray for any grace or virtue, or for any disposition of mind which is needful to qualify us for the Kingdom of God.'[7] The gift of the Spirit thus produces within us definite effects. In Luke xi. 13, where the Lord mentions it for the first time, He does so in connexion with prayer, since it is the most needful thing for which we could ask.[8] Certain graces of the Spirit are absolutely necessary for salvation, such as faith in Christ, saving knowledge of Christian doctrine, and His possession and preservation of the unworldly mind, which is thereby directed into good living. Other graces may be spoken of as spiritually profitable. And the Holy Spirit will be given in proportion as this gift is really desired.[9] 'In the Lord's Prayer, wherein the Holy Spirit is asked, the petition is not formally expressed, but contained in other words.' Not only, however, to those first disciples was this gift promised in answer to prayer. 'This promise of our Saviour concerning the Holy Spirit does equally regard the Church in all ages, to the end of the world.'[10]

The contributions of the two Bishops, Beveridge and Bull, do little more than cover the same ground. It is Beveridge's belief that 'God sends His Spirit only to those who are His sons by adoption,'[11] which at first seems to be a narrow view of the Spirit's mission. It would appear, however, that he has in mind the work of the Spirit particularly in the hearts of believers, which was a theme always uppermost in his

1 *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, pp. 161 ff. 2 *Ibid.*, p. 170.
3 *Ibid.*, pp. 226 f. 4 *Ibid.*, p. 222. 5 *Ibid.*, p. 115.
6 *Discourse concerning the Operations of the Holy Spirit*, pt. i. chap. i. § 1.
7 *Ibid.*, ii. 4. 8 *Ibid.*, ii. 1. 9 *Ibid.*, ii. 2. 10 *Ibid.*, ii. 4.
11 *Thesaurus Theologicus*, i. (Gal. iv. 6).

thought. 'This Spirit,' he writes, 'is to continue with us as long as the world shall last, illuminating our minds with spiritual truths, sanctifying our natures, exciting to, and conducting us in, the ways of holiness, comforting and supporting us under difficulties and temptations, assisting us in our devotions, marking us out as the children of God here, and heirs of eternal glory hereafter.'[1] Like Owen, Bull displays an interest in the work of the Spirit in the Old Dispensation, and sets himself to answer the question whether the Holy Spirit was given in Old Testament times. 'Undoubtedly it was,' he replies, 'for otherwise there could not have been so many pious and holy men under the Mosaic Law.' But he makes a distinction which he is anxious that his readers should observe. 'The Spirit was indeed first given under the law, but not by or through the law, since this grace was mutually given and received as derived from the grace of the Gospel.' It is at least manifest, he observes, that 'in the times of the Old Testament God gave the grace of His Holy Spirit in small and moderate portions: under the Gospel, abundantly and bountifully.'[2]

Sherlock expresses the conviction that 'though the one supreme God cannot be sent, nor given, yet in the ever-blessed Trinity one Divine Person may send and give another';[3] which is not inconsistent with the belief that the whole Godhead is present with and through the Holy Spirit, while He Himself alone may now be said to be sent. Comparatively little notice was taken of this subject in the controversial years which followed Sherlock's *Vindication*, until Matthew Henry's *Exposition of the New Testament* appeared. He agrees with his contemporary, Bishop Bull, that the Holy Spirit dwelt in the Old Testament saints 'from eternity,' but that His visible manifestation to the whole world did not take effect till Pentecost, when 'the gift of the Holy Ghost was purchased by the blood of Christ.'[4] It was then that He came 'in a more plentiful effusion of His gifts, graces, and powers, than had ever yet been.'[5] 'The Spirit's coming was Christ's visit to His disciples, not a transient but a permanent

[1] *Thesaurus Theologicus* (*Articles of the Christian Faith*).
[2] *Harmonia Apostolica*, xi. [3] *Vindication*, p. 193.
[4] On John vii. 39 ('The Spirit was not yet given,' &c.).
[5] On John xv. 26.

one ; and such a visit as abundantly retrieved the sight of Him.'[1] Further, 'the coming of the Spirit was absolutely necessary to the carrying on of Christ's interest on earth. . . . Convincing work is the Spirit's work ; He can do it effectually, and none but He. Man may open the cause, but it is the Spirit only that can open the heart.' Nor does He stop there, for He guides the heart into all truth.[2] It is essential, adds Henry, that all who desire to spread the Gospel should first be baptized with the Holy Ghost, even as was Christ.[3]

III

Among the philosophers, Francis Bacon and George Campbell may be selected as making reference to the Mission of the Holy Spirit. In his *Confession of Faith* Bacon writes : 'I believe that the work of the Spirit, though it be not tied to any means in heaven or earth, yet it is ordinarily dispensed by the preaching of the Word, the administration of the sacraments, the covenant of the Fathers upon the children, prayer, reading, the censures of the Church, the society of the godly, the cross and afflictions, God's benefits, His judgements upon others, miracles, the contemplation of His creatures.' Here is manifestly a comprehensiveness born of experience. In a sermon on 2 Tim. i. 7 Campbell alludes to the Holy Spirit, 'the Third of the Sacred Three,' as bestowing on the Early Church certain powers that were meant only to be temporary. His text, however, must refer to 'a prevailing disposition of soul, for "love" and a "sound mind" are never ranked among the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost.' 'Paraclete,' then, means essentially 'Monitor,' or 'Prompter' : 'Advocate' and 'Comforter' are too narrow.[4] There is nothing to record by way of connected thought on the Spirit's mission within the boundary of philosophy. These two seem to have been the only writers strictly within that boundary to touch on the subject, and they themselves were separated by at least a century and a half.

Quaker belief in an immediate influence of the Holy Spirit

1 On John xvi. 16.

2 On John xvi. 7 f.

3 On Matt. iii. 16 f. See also his comment on Acts xix. 2 concerning the necessity for the 'seal of the Spirit' to Christian profession.

4 *A New Translation of the Four Gospels*, vol. ii. (on John xiv. 16).

on all true disciples of Christ is well known. George Fox made reference to this 'inner light' as a convicting, reproving, guiding, and empowering quality.[1] Consequently Barclay declares that it is impossible to know God apart from the Holy Spirit.[2] Since, also, the Son is 'now withdrawn, as to the outward man,' and therefore 'doth teach and instruct mankind inwardly, by His own Spirit,' it is impossible to know the Son apart from the Holy Spirit.[3] With these sentiments of Barclay's the early Methodists professed entire agreement, and Charles Wesley's hymns point to the same conclusion.[4] Moreover, inasmuch as these early Methodists were themselves the human agents whereby so many came into a personal knowledge of God in Christ, by the Spirit, they saw in this very fact abundant evidence of their own mission by the same Spirit, and that the Spirit was working through them. 'I entreat reasonable men to weigh this thoroughly,' wrote Wesley, 'whether the fact does not plainly prove the call? whether He who enables us thus to save souls alive, does not commission us so to do? whether, by giving us power to pluck these brands out of the burning, He does not authorize us to exert it?'[5]

The Mission of the Spirit, therefore, is that of a voluntary Agent, through whom the Father and the Son are present in the world along with Himself. In this way the disciples of Christ experience that added blessing which a continuation of His bodily presence could never have secured. By this fuller ministry of the Spirit, based on the Gospel and the work of Christ, men were to be convicted of sin, and guided into a new life through the ministrations of the Church, private devotion, and Divine influence on the individual mind. As Bunyan had said, the work of the Spirit was a vital supplement to the work of Christ. Let the will only be exercised in a real desire after the Spirit of God, and the Divine Life would gradually flood the soul, creating within it an entirely

1 On the term 'empowering,' see Otto, *Idea of the Holy*, p. 156, on 'daemonic,' super-energetic personalities; though this has not the *spiritual* content of the word as used by Fox.

2 *Catechism*, chap. i.

3 *Apology for the True Christian Divinity*, prop. 2.

4 See especially his hymn, 'Spirit of faith, come down.'

5 John Wesley's *Works*, viii. 468 (see B. Gregory, *Scriptural Church Principles*, ii. 64).

new disposition. Moreover, a new disposition toward God would mean a new disposition toward one's fellows, which points the way to the reconstruction of society. Through souls which have been spiritually renewed, through their faith and labour, is the Kingdom of God to be brought in—that 'whole concrete harmony which would be effected by the Spirit's unfettered activity.'[1]

Appended Notes

I

Mediaeval theologians from time to time had examined the precise nature of the Easter gift of the Holy Spirit recorded in John xx. 22 f., and varied interpretations had been put upon it. There had been general agreement, however, that the Easter gift was essentially preliminary to the Pentecostal; whether in connexion with the power of remitting sins, which the Roman Catholics held was thereby committed to the Church, or as imparting a firmer faith in the Resurrection and a fuller understanding of the Scriptures, which was the belief of the Reformers. Never before Pentecost had the Spirit been so unreservedly bestowed.[2] So Donne explains the greater fullness of the Pentecostal outpouring by reason of the fact that, whereas on Easter Day the Spirit was given simply to the Apostles, on the Day of Pentecost He was given to the whole body of the disciples for the purpose of their mission to the world.[3] John Lightfoot is of the opinion that the Easter gift was intended to unify them as a band of brothers, and to enable them to work with perfect accord 'without emulation, discord, or comparisons; without heartburning, scorning, or envying.'[4] Matthew Henry thinks that Christ, after His resurrection, breathed on them all together—not distinctly—as an earnest of the fuller gift at Pentecost which

1 Miss Dougall, in *The Spirit*, &c. Canon A. W. Robinson, of Canterbury, has made the following interesting comparison: There were 120 disciples in the Upper Room, awaiting the Pentecostal Gift. After receiving it, they determined to win the world. Gibbon has estimated the population of the Roman Empire at that time at 120 millions, which means a proportion of one disciple to every million people. Can we imagine seven disciples meeting and determining to win London?

2 *The Holy Spirit in the Mediaeval Church*, p. 342. Also Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*, pp. 108, 340.

3 *Sermon* 29.

4 *Commentary on Acts* (Acts ii. 1).

each was individually to receive. In his view, there can be no reasonable objection to the statement that the power of retaining or remitting sins was actually bestowed on the Church by her risen Lord, and has been her 'general charter' ever since. But, as would be expected from one of Henry's outlook, he is careful to show that he means this in no sacerdotal sense. The 'general charter' of the Church is to proclaim the Gospel, and it is this proclamation which condemns or acquits through the working of the Holy Spirit in the soul.[1] Similarly, in speaking of the Easter gift as 'an earnest of Pentecost,' Wesley regards the remission or the retention of sins as dependent on the presence or absence of repentance and faith. 'So far is plain,' he adds. 'But here arises a difficulty: Are not the sins of one who truly repents, and unfeignedly believes in Christ, "remitted" without sacerdotal absolution; and are not the sins of one who does not repent or believe "retained" even with it? What, then,' he asks, 'does this commission imply? Can it imply any more than, 1. A power of declaring with authority the Christian terms of pardon? Whose sins are remitted, and whose retained? as in our daily form of absolution. And, 2. A power of inflicting and remitting ecclesiastical censures? that is, of excluding from, and re-admitting into, a Christian congregation.'[2]

For centuries previously, theologians had affirmed as an undoubted fact the Spirit's influence on the world of men from the beginning; so that, in the words of Dr. Percy Gardner, 'what took place was a development on new lines of a known power, and not the sudden advent of a power wholly new.'[3] This, of course, is not to superimpose New Testament explanations of such a 'power' on earlier objects of it, for explanations change in accordance with Divine revelation and human development, while the eternal fact itself abides as before. Now, however, the Mission of the Spirit was to impress men's hearts with the character and principles of Jesus,[4] and to reinforce them against 'the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places.'[5]

1 *Exposition of the N.T.* (John xx. 22).
2 *Notes on the N.T.* (John xx. 23).
3 *The Practical Basis of Christian Belief*, p. 221.
4 *Ibid.*, p. 222. 5 *Ibid.*, p. 267.

II

The phenomena which accompanied the Pentecostal outpouring have been receiving close attention in recent years, such a modern authority as Professor C. Anderson Scott suggesting that the various elements connected with emotion and faith in the psychological situation would, in their ' heightened ' state, account for the hearing of wind and the seeing of flame—' phenomena that were traditionally associated with the Spirit.' [1] It may be remembered that the account in the second chapter of Acts refers to these phenomena as illustrative rather than actual—sound *as of* wind, and tongues *like as of* fire, though this would not affect Professor Scott's suggestion, whatever may be thought of it. With regard to the gift of tongues, John Lightfoot believes that it repaired the loss sustained by the confusion of tongues at Babel (Gen. xi. 9), and that therefore this gift was one of intelligible speech.[2] On the other hand, Professor Scott likens the ' tongues ' at Pentecost to the ' tongues ' at Corinth, which *no one* could understand ; so that they were not foreign languages, and therefore of an intelligible nature, but mere sounds which liberated ' stored-up recollections of the " wonderful works of God." ' ' There can be little doubt,' he writes, ' that the glossolalia of Pentecost did not differ in character from that which was afterwards a familiar feature in the worship of the Church at Corinth. That is to say, so far from it being speech intelligible to those who spoke a different language from the speaker, it was speech or utterance which was intelligible to no one.' [3] But if it were, it could not even have required the interpretation which St. Paul seems to suggest it did (1 Cor. xiv. 13, 27, 28). Again, if what the crowd heard was not ' coherent or even intelligible speech, but such utterances as quickened in their minds a sympathetic response,' [4] it was, to say the least, highly unusual that utterances of a totally unintelligible character should have ' set loose ' in so impressive a manner the people's recollections of God's wonderful works. The illustration given by Professor Scott of a Salvationist assembly of mixed nationality responding to the recurring

1 In *The Spirit*, &c. (ed. B. H. Streeter), pp. 126 f.
2 *Commentary on Acts* (*ad loc.*).
3 *The Spirit*, &c., p. 127. 4 *Ibid.*, p. 128.

theme of the saving love of God in Christ, assumes intelligibility in the theme itself, which is quite consistent with its recognition 'each time the theme was touched upon.' It is difficult to understand how recognition of a recurrent theme could take place in respect of a succession of what would appear to be merely ecstatic sounds. The explanation afforded by the late Professor James Hope Moulton[1] points to the 'tongues' at Pentecost as intelligible sounds, while in languages foreign to the speakers. In 1 Cor. xiv. 11, so Dr. Moulton observed, the word *βάρβαρος*, translated 'barbarian,' means one who speaks as a foreigner. From Plautus we have: 'Philemon wrote this play, Plautus translated it into the foreign language (*βάρβαρη*).' Plautus, who wrote this extract in Greek, referred to Latin as the foreign language, Latin being a perfectly intelligible tongue! The voice, of which the Apostle might not know the meaning (1 Cor. xiv. 11), must not therefore be pressed to exclude of necessity the natural languages of the world. Following on this, Dr. Moulton expressed the view that the phenomenon of unconscious memory may well be the key to the problem. It has been alleged that St. Luke is wrong on the subject of Pentecost when he states that the gift of 'tongues' was a gift of various languages. This, however, may be explained by the phenomenon mentioned above. Jews from all the provinces named in Acts ii. came to Jerusalem at this time, and on arriving at the holy city they might have burst forth into ecstatic praise. Though they would all know Greek, they would naturally praise God in their own provincial language. The Apostles, then, must have heard these different tongues in audible prayer, and what they heard must have sunk into their subconscious memory. On the Day of Pentecost the Apostles' ecstasy, like delirium,[2] would set free memories of the 'tongues' they had heard, which would account for the strange happenings recorded. This does not preclude the fact of the gift of the Holy Spirit, which, in arousing such enthusiasm, simply took that particular form at that particular time.

The gift of 'tongues,' so Dr. Moulton remarked, was not for

[1] Lecturing in Didsbury College, Manchester, in 1911.

[2] Dr. Moulton noted a case on record in which a domestic servant quoted Hebrew at great length. She attended an old minister who was in the habit of reciting Hebrew, and had constantly heard him so doing. When, therefore, she was in delirium in an illness, she gave vent to Hebrew from her 'unconscious memory.'

missionary purposes. On the Day of Pentecost, for instance, the disciples of Christ spoke simply 'as the Spirit gave them utterance,' and this certainly meant no mastery of new languages. When, after Paul and Barnabas had been preaching in Greek at Lystra (Acts xiv.), the people thronged around excitedly, they did not understand what the excitement meant, for the people spoke 'in the speech of Lycaonia'; and they continued mystified until they saw the garlanded ox. Manifestly, then, Paul and Barnabas possessed no gift of interpretation of tongues, for Greek was good enough for missionary use. It would seem as if the 'tongues' were intended only to 'startle' unbelievers. Yet this very conclusion lends colour to the suggestion that they must have been something which people could perceive to be intelligible. For example, many who cannot understand German can recognize German *as* German. It may be readily admitted that the gift had dangerous possibilities, since intense religious excitement is often divorced from high ethical conduct. A mind superseded is a mind unhinged, and it is when religion takes an ecstatic form that the divorce between it and ethics most generally happens. In the case in point, there were many elements in Greek religion, such as the mysteries and the worship of Dionysus, which would tend to encourage excitement of this kind. Dr. Moulton had no intention of implying that the 'tongues' at Pentecost were not due to an inspiring operation of the Holy Spirit. St. Paul styles them *χαρίσματα*, though of the lowest order.

III

In the Early Church the healing powers of the Holy Spirit were regarded as available for the sick who exercised faith in the Lord Jesus with that end particularly in view. Comparatively little attention is given in the theological writings of these two centuries to a healing mission of the Spirit: Christian thought was mainly occupied in an entirely different quarter. Brother Lawrence, however, expresses himself unmistakably on the subject. 'If we were well accustomed to the exercise of the Presence of God,' he declares, 'all bodily diseases would be much alleviated thereby. . . . I cannot understand how a soul, which is with God and which desires

Him alone, can feel pain.'[1] In the course of the century in which Lawrence lived, namely the seventeenth, instances of faith-healing appear to have taken place among the Baptists, Quakers, and Puritans ; and, in the eighteenth century, among the Pietists and Methodists.[2] While Wesley fully believed in medical science—as is clear from his *Primitive Physic*, which is a compilation of remedies of a homely order—he makes mention in his *Journal* of occurrences, in his own experience, of healing and physical renewal for which he can account only by ascribing them to supernatural agency. Increasingly is the wonderful unity of mind and body being realized, and as increasingly is the attention of modern thought being concentrated on the association of this unity with the principles of healing practised in the Early Church. Dr. Hadfield points out that these principles are now employed by medical science in the treatment of a large proportion of mental cases, and that the influence of religious emotion is a factor that psychotherapy cannot afford to overlook.[3] In the Report of the Committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury to consider the ministry of healing, issued on January 8, 1924, the following conclusion is put forward : ' No evidence was found of any cases of healing by religious methods which cannot be paralleled by similar cures wrought by psychotherapy without religion and by instances of spontaneous healing which often occur even in the gravest cases of ordinary medical practice.' The Report continues : ' These facts do not, in our opinion, detract from the good done by many religious healers, and where the religious influence is of a wise and reasonable kind, greater and more permanent results may be expected than from non-religious methods.' Again, ' Spiritual healing must not exclude medical means or methods, which have their due share in the resultant recovery. When spiritual treatment has been used, we claim that not merely is the disease healed or alleviated, but the whole nature of the patient raised to a higher level. In other words, in spiritual healing, the healing of the spirit is primary, the healing of the body, secondary.' Physical, as well as mental disease, is now being regarded as

[1] 13*th Letter* (November 28, 1690).
[2] See *Encycl. Brit.*, art. ' Faith-Healing.'
[3] In *The Spirit*, &c., pp. 111 ff.

more and more open to this treatment. 'No man,' said the late Rev. Charles Wenyon, M.D., M.Ch., L.R.C.P., in commenting upon the above Report,[1] 'who has had any considerable experience of the healing art, can deny that there are things in connexion with the body that physiology by itself can never explain. Medical science to-day recognizes the existence of forces outside the mere machinery of the human body, and there is a growing reaction against the materialistic attitude of the past generation of doctors and scientists.' Concerning the operation of such forces in the healing of disease, Dr. Wenyon expressed himself thus: 'The truth of the matter seems to be that there is something that opens the bodily mechanism to forces which we know nothing of, though we are dimly aware of their existence. Our Saviour knew all about that something, and how to bring it into play. But He repeatedly insisted that it could not become operative apart from the exercise of faith on the part of the sufferer; and that, where this faith was wanting, no cure was possible. So I do not think that faith-healing can ever become a universal matter: it must always be conditioned by the spiritual possibilities of the person affected. There is also the factor of the agent through whom the healing power is transmitted. Some doctors, as soon as they enter a sick-room, seem to radiate a spirit of optimism and confidence which immediately produces an effect on the patient. So also there are lay men and women whose presence in a sick-room is most helpful and encouraging. Personal magnetism counts for a lot in these matters, and I am glad to see that the Committee's Report recognizes the fact that this helpful power is not the monopoly of the priest or the minister, but a gift possessed by all kinds of people.' In conclusion, Dr. Wenyon remarked: 'To sum up, I can lay down this rule. Other things being equal, a Christian man with a lively faith in God has a much better chance of recovery from illness than the man without religion, or the merely nominal Christian. That,' he said, 'is my experience, and I believe it to be the experience of the majority of doctors.'

1 In an interview reported in *The Methodist Recorder* (January 24, 1924) shortly after its publication.

XI

THE SPIRIT AND THE CHURCH

'No dispensation of the Spirit, no Church.'

JOHN OWEN.

XI

THE SPIRIT AND THE CHURCH

I

One of the burning questions at issue between the Reformers and the Roman Catholics had been that of the true definition of the word 'church.' The former, taking a 'spiritual' view, declared the Church to 'consist of all those who really know God in Christ through the written Word and the inward teaching of the Spirit, who have been cleansed by the Blood of Christ and sanctified by the power of the self-same Spirit.'[1] The latter, taking an 'official' view, held the Church to be a visible organism, consisting primarily of the priestly order, and under the Holy Spirit's infallible guidance. Greek opinion agreed that the Church, thus infallibly guided, is the one Divinely appointed interpreter of the Word of God, and preserved from erring in matters of faith.[2] Accordingly they did not hesitate to affirm that those who separate from the Church —by which they meant the Greek Orthodox Communion— also separate from the Holy Spirit.[3]

Over against these theories promulgated by the two ancient branches of the Christian Church, the Arminian teaching followed the lead of the Reformers, that of the Lutheran section especially. The convictions expressed by the mass of English Protestant divines were equally decisive. Lancelot Andrewes, in the course of his *Responsio ad Cardinalis Bellarmini Apologiam*, denies that the Pope is the 'Vicar of Christ.'

1 *The Holy Spirit in the Mediaeval Church*, p. 341.

2 See Winer, *Confessions of Christendom*, pp. 51 f., and the *Conf. Orth.* Cp. the *Conf. of Dositheus*: πιστεύομεν . . . τὴν καθολ. ἐκκλησίαν ὡς λαλοῦσαν ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀδύνατον πάντῃ ἁμαρτῆσαι ἢ ὅλως ἀπατῆσαι καὶ ἀπατηθῆναι. This view as expounded by the modern Greek theologian Androutsos is set forth by Dr. Gavin, *Greek Orthodox Thought*, pp. 8 f. Whereas, however, the Greeks referred to the infallibility of the Church as expressed through the bishops, under the direction of the Holy Spirit who dwells in the Church, and rejected the idea of an earthly head of the Body of Christ (*Conf. Orth.*—Διδασκόμεθα, πῶς μόνος ὁ Χριστὸς εἶναι κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας κατὰ τὴν διδασκαλίαν τοῦ ἀποστόλου), the Romans urged the infallibility of the Pope.

3 Gavin, *ibid.*, p. 250.

That office, he affirms, is for One only, namely, the Holy Spirit.[1] This is a truth which confronts him throughout all his *Sermons on the Holy Spirit*. No baptism, no preaching, no sacrament, no prayer, can possibly avail at any time without the Spirit. That Christ's bodily presence was foolishly considered indispensable is evident from such passages as Matt. xvii. 4, and John xi. 21 ; but ' the corporal had to be removed, that the spiritual might take place.' Indeed, the missionary endeavour of the Church could never have been actually helped forward by the Lord, as it has been, had He been localized in the flesh.[2] With the Puritans in mind, Andrewes observes : ' The same Spirit that loveth unanimity loveth uniformity : unity even in matter of circumstance, in matter of place. Thus the Church was begun ; thus it must be continued.'[3] Such was the High Church view. Yet Andrewes was not blind to the spiritual facts presented by communions other than his own, and he does not press episcopacy, as generally understood, as a vital necessity to corporate spiritual life. ' Though our government be by Divine right,' he remarks, ' it follows not either that there is no salvation, or that a Church cannot stand, without it. He must needs be stone blind that sees not Churches standing without it.' English Archbishops such as Whitgift, Sancroft, and Tenison, together with the Irish Archbishop Ussher, seem to have been in general agreement with this position.[4] Certainly no encouragement was afforded by Anglicans or Puritans to the doctrine of the Church as expounded by Rome. ' The Papists,' says Sterry, ' persuade us to receive the testimony, not of the Spirit, but of the Church, for a touchstone of truth. . . . Thus the Church's authority, not the demonstration of the Holy Ghost, shall be the light of faith to truth. . . . But we need no visible judge on earth to determine upon our consciences what is Scripture, what is the sense of Scripture. We have an invisible Judge and Witness in our own breasts : " He that believeth, hath the

[1] So John Donne (*Sermon* 31, Gen. i. 2) : ' The office of the Holy Ghost is to gather, to establish, to illumine, to govern that Church which the Son of God, from whom, together with the Father, the Holy Ghost proceeds, hath purchased with His blood.'

[2] *Sermon* 4 *on the Holy Spirit* (John xvi. 7).

[3] *Sermon* 1 *on the Holy Spirit* (Acts ii. 1–4).

[4] See J. R. Gregory, *Anglican Orders and Apostolical Succession*.

testimony in himself" (1 John v. 10), for he hath the Spirit.'[1] This was to be expected from a popular Puritan preacher. A similar outlook is perceptible in William Chillingworth's *Religion of Protestants*, where his views are set forth in the form of an argument with a Jesuit writer. 'If you say your Church's infallibility is your ground,' he reasons, 'I demand again some infallible ground both for the Church's infallibility, and for this—that yours is the Church.'[2] 'The Spirit may very well teach the Church, and yet the Church fall into, and continue in, error by not regarding what she is taught by the Spirit.'[3] It is therefore not enough to conceive 'the Spirit absolutely promised to the succession of bishops, of which many have been notoriously and confessedly wicked men.'[4] The Jesuit opponent puts forward John xiv. 16 ('. . . that He may be with you for ever') as showing that the promise of the Spirit to the Church is absolute—'whereas,' asserts Chillingworth, 'it is indeed most clearly and expressly conditional; being both, in the words before, restrained to those only that "love God and keep His commandments" (v. 15), and, in the words after, flatly denied to all whom the Scriptures style by the name of "the world" (v. 17).' No theory of Succession, so he continues, is spiritually adequate, for we do not know with certainty that any Pope 'loves God and keeps His commandments,' while we do know that many Popes have been 'diabolical.'[5] In Chillingworth's opinion the Roman theory was too mechanical to be true. 'The Catholic Church signifies one company of faithful people,' declares the Jesuit; 'which,' retorts the author to him, 'is repugnant to your own grounds: for you require not true faith, but only the profession of it, to make men members of the visible Church.'[6] To the stated objection that the absence of episcopal succession in the Roman sense makes all Protestantism heretical, he makes answer 'that nothing but want of truth and holding error can make or prove any man or church heretical.' . . . 'Why,' he asks, 'should I not be made a true and orthodox Christian by believing all the doctrine of Christ, though I cannot derive my descent from a perpetual succession that believed it before

[1] *The Spirit's Conviction of Sin*, p. 28. [2] ii. § 45
[3] iii. 71. [4] *Ibid.*, 34. [5] *Ibid.*, 75. [6] v. 7.

me ? ' [1] Even if it be conceded—what cannot be proved—' that the Fathers make succession a certain and perpetual mark of the true Church,' any continuity of teaching that may be implied in this succession is not of necessity preserved by it from impurities, as Roman development of doctrine shows.[2] ' Concerning *our* ordinations,' concludes Chillingworth, ' besides that I have proved it impossible that they should be so doubtful as yours [the Jesuit's], according to your own principles ; I answer that experience shows them certainly sufficient to bring men to faith and repentance, and consequently to salvation : and that, if there were any secret defect of anything necessary, which we cannot help, God will certainly supply it.' [3]

Bishop Pearson dwells but little on the relationship of the Holy Spirit to the Church. He remarks that ' the office of the same Spirit is to join us unto Christ, and make us members of that one body of which our Saviour is the Head ; ' [4] also that ' it is the office of the same Spirit to sanctify and set apart persons for the duty of the ministry.' [5] The two great Puritans, Owen and Howe, are, however, more interesting in this particular connexion. In his work *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, Owen emphasizes the spiritual nature of the Church as founded by Christ, and the purpose for the world which the Spirit of Christ desires to achieve through it. It is clear, so he insists, that there is a special intimacy between the Spirit and the Church. ' John, saluting the churches of Asia, prayeth for grace for them " from God the Father and the seven spirits that are before His throne " (Rev. i. 4) ; that is, the Holy Spirit of God considered in His care of the Church, and His yielding supplies unto it.' [6] As the Holy Spirit prepared a natural body for Christ, so now He prepares and perfects for Him a mystical body, which is His Church (Col. iii. 4).[7] The New Testament naturally reveals the beginnings of this process. In it we see how the Holy Spirit was sent upon the disciples before they were allowed to begin their

[1] *Religion of Protestants*, vi. 38. Reference may be made to Fénelon's booklet *Sur le ministère des pasteurs*, in which the Roman doctrine of ministerial validity—as dependent on unbroken episcopal ordination—is upheld, and the validity of all Protestant ' Orders ' denied.

[2] *Ibid.*, 41. [3] vii. 18. [4] *Exposition of the Creed* (*Art. VIII*), ii. 4.

[5] *Ibid.*, 6. [6] p. 133. [7] p. 429.

work (Acts ii.)[1] how He revealed to the early Church those truths concerning the Divine Nature which have been enshrined in the Doctrine of the Trinity,[2] and how He bestowed gifts on the Church for the edification of the whole body of believers, with a view to what is most expedient for each member (1 Cor. vi. 12 ; x. 23 ; 2 Cor. viii. 10).[3] 'The promise and gift of the Spirit under the Gospel,' contends Owen, 'is not made nor granted unto any peculiar sort of persons only, but unto all believers, as their conditions and occasions do require.'[4] It is in such a full sense that Christ is spoken of as dwelling in the Church by His Spirit (Matt. xviii. 19 f.),[5] and it cannot be denied that the Spirit of Christ works in the Church of the present day just as much as He did on the Day of Pentecost, though, it may be, in a different manner.[6] But Howe is not so certain of this. Writing in 1685 to his flock in London he says : 'It appears that the discernible restraint and departure of that Blessed Spirit from the Church of Christ in so great a measure, for many foregoing generations, in comparison of the plentiful effusion of it in the first age, hath ensued upon the growth of that wrathful, contentious spirit which showed itself early in the Gnostic, but much more in the after Arian persecution, which was not in some places less bloody than the pagan persecution had been before. . . . And we are told, "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His" (Rom. viii. 9).' Not, however, that Howe despairs of the spiritual condition of the Church. He continues : 'As the bitterness of Christians one towards another chased away His Spirit, His Spirit shall vanquish and drive away all that bitterness, and consume our other dross. And as the apostasy long ago foretold, and of so long continuance in the Christian Church, hath been begun and continued by constant war against the Spirit of Christ ; the restitution and recovery of the Church, and the reduction of Christianity to its ancient self and primitive state, will be by the victory of the Spirit of Christ over that so contrary spirit. Then shall all the enmity, pride, wrathfulness, and cruelty, which have rent the Church of Christ, and made it so little itself, be melted down ; and with all their great impurities besides, earthliness, carnality,

1 *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, pp. 216 ff. 2 p. 214. 3 p. 8.
4 p. 170. 5 pp. 219 f. 6 p. 171.

love of this present world, and prevalence of sensual lusts, be purged more generally away; and His repairing work be done in a way grievous to no one, whereby those that are most absolutely conquered will be most highly pleased: not by might or by power, but by the Spirit of the Lord.'[1] The contentious spirit referred to by Howe was exemplified by phases of the debate carried on between the Establishment and Nonconformity concerning the validity of the latter's ministry, and the outlook of the Nonconformists shows distinct resemblances to that of Chillingworth. Howe had received ordination at the hands of Charles Herle, a prominent member of the Westminster Assembly, and other Puritan ministers; and Rogers, his biographer, relates how he used to say that 'there were few men whose ordination had been so truly primitive as his, having been devoted to the sacred office by a primitive bishop and his officiating presbytery.'[2] This was certainly not the view taken of his ordination by the Bishop of Exeter, who, in an interview with him, pressed him for his reasons for being a Nonconformist. Howe, excusing himself from any full presentation of his reasons, specified reordination as one of the points required by the English Church which he could not concede. 'Pray, sir,' said the Bishop, 'what *hurt* is there in being twice ordained?' '*Hurt*, my lord,' rejoined Howe, 'it hurts my understanding; the thought is shocking; it is an absurdity; since nothing can have two beginnings. I am sure I am a minister of Christ, and am ready to debate that matter with your lordship, if your lordship pleases; but I cannot begin again to be a minister.'[3]

Bishop Butler's reference to the spiritual nature of the Church Universal in his *Analogy* is reminiscent of Owen. Christ, he writes, 'founded a Church, to be to mankind a standing memorial of religion, and invitation to it; which He promised to be with always, even to the end. He exercises an invisible government over it Himself and by His Spirit. . . . Of this Church, all persons scattered over the world, who live in obedience to His laws, are members.'[4] The choice of 'His,'

[1] Quoted by Rogers in his *Life and Character of John Howe*, pp. 143 f.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 18. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 74.
[4] ii. 5. Hobbes defines the Church as 'a State composed of Christians' (Erdmann, *History of Philosophy*, i. p. 720), which is too rigidly national to be spiritually true.

instead of 'its,' in regard to 'laws' is significant of a spiritual emphasis sometimes too obscure in ecclesiastical pronouncements. Similarly the Friends speak of the term 'Church,' in a narrower sense, as a company of people assembled under the influence of the Holy Spirit, and united in belief of the fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion; though no suggestion is made that, in the case of anything like a complete definition, Butler and the Friends would be in agreement, since, for example, Quakerism contemplates a wider sense in which the Church includes non-Christians in so far as they follow the inner light set within their hearts by the Divine Spirit.[1] On the ground that the Holy Spirit chooses whom He will at any time, and for any duty, Quaker belief disallows any separate order of ministry, including in a ministerial order every true Christian; for no one can lay down any rule as to whom the call to discharge functions of Christian ministration may or may not come. We find Barclay insisting on personal obedience to the inner light as the primary necessity for any minister of the Gospel. 'That which we oppose,' he states, 'is the distinction of laity and clergy, which in the Scripture is not to be found.' All Christians, he holds, are equally under the guidance of the Spirit, and in any act of corporate worship should take no part unless they feel themselves so guided.[2]

Two views of the Church are thus clearly defined: (1) The Roman and the Greek, which regards the Church as the visible, organic Body of Christ, consisting primarily of the clerical priesthood, with a spiritual infallibility attaching to it either through the Pope (according to the Roman Catholics) or the bishops under the guidance of the Holy Spirit (according to the Greeks); (2) The Protestant, in general, which regards it as the mystical Body of Christ, of which all the truly regenerated are members, and in which the Holy Spirit, working through the Word and every ordinance, confers a priesthood on all believers.[3] Within Protestant circles, the discussion as to

1 Cp. Barclay, *Apology*, prop. 10.

2 *Ibid.*, prop. 11.

3 Cp. James Denney, *Studies in Theology*, p. 189: 'It is not in the fellowship of a priestly or episcopal order . . . that the Church is one; it is one in the fellowship of the Holy Ghost.' Also J. Agar Beet, *The Church, the Churches, and the Sacraments* p. 50 f.: 'The only permanent priesthood mentioned in the N.T. is that of Christ and all His servants.' So W. N. Clarke, *Outlines of Chr. Theol.*

whether episcopal ordination is essential to the exercise of a valid ministry is brought to a head by John Wesley.

II

'How much do we almost continually hear about the Church!' exclaims Wesley.[1] 'With many it is matter of daily conversation. And yet how few understand what they talk of: how few know what the term means! A more ambiguous word than this, "the Church," is scarce to be found in the English language.' An examination of his text (Eph. iv. 1–6) leads him to 'a clear unexceptionable answer to that question, What is the Church? The catholic or universal Church is,' he pronounces, 'all the persons in the universe whom God hath so called out of the world as to entitle them to the preceding character; as to be "one body," united by "one Spirit," having "one faith, one hope, one baptism; one God and Father of all."' On the other hand, 'two or three Christian believers united together are a Church in the narrowest sense of the word,' and Wesley quotes with approval the declaration of Cyprian that 'where two or three believers are met together, there is a Church.' Such considerations, along with the definition found in the nineteenth Article of the Church of England, leave no doubt in Wesley's mind as to the proper meaning of the term 'Church of England.' 'It is,' he affirms, 'that part, those members of the universal Church, who are inhabitants of England. The Church of England is that body of men in England in whom "there is one Spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith"; which have "one baptism," and "one God and Father of all." This and this alone is the Church of England, according to the doctrine of the Apostle.' In consequence, 'he who has not that Spirit, and faith, and hope, is no member of this body. . . . In a word, none that is dead to God can be a member of His Church.'[2]

[1] *Sermon* 79, *On the Church.*

[2] See the great Methodist theologian, Dr. W. B Pope (*Compendium*, ii. p. 330): 'It is not first the Church, and then the Spirit; but, conversely, the Spirit forms the Church as the sphere and organ of His working: a distinction which is of great importance.' In a *Statement concerning Church Membership*, adopted by the Wesleyan Methodist Conference of 1908, the following occurs: 'The Church of Christ is the company of His disciples, consisting of all those who accept Him as the Son of God and their Saviour from sin, and who love one another for His sake and join hands to

Wesley's sermon *On Schism*, the eightieth in the published series, shows with what great disfavour he regarded any 'causeless separation from a body of living Christians.' 'To separate ourselves from a body of living Christians, with whom we were before united, is a grievous breach of the law of love. It is the nature of love to unite us together; and the greater the love, the stricter the union.' 'I am now,' he continues, 'and have been from my youth, a member and a minister of the Church of England. And I have no desire nor design to separate from it till my soul separates from my body. Yet if I was not permitted to remain therein, without omitting what God requires me to do, it would then become meet, and right, and my bounden duty, to separate from it without delay.' In such a case, 'the sin of separation, with all the evils consequent upon it, would not lie upon me, but upon those who constrained me to make that separation, by requiring of me such terms of communion as I could not in conscience comply with.' This seems a fair characterization of the beginnings of Methodism as a separate movement. The measures adopted by Wesley, some of them in decided opposition to his personal inclinations, were prompted by the spiritual necessities of the situation; whether, as at the first, they were new methods of evangelization, or, as in later years, acts which ensured the privileges of full spiritual ministration to the members of the Methodist Societies. Those who had been 'driven out' against their desire could not rightly and properly be designated 'schismatic.' The matter was made the subject of question and answer in the Conference of 1744, in the formal wording of which the views of Wesley are plainly seen:

'*Q.* Do you not entail a schism on the Church? *i.e.* Is it not probable that your hearers, after your death, will be scattered into all sects and parties? Or, that they will form themselves into a distinct sect?'

work out the common salvation. The Church is the family of the redeemed children of God; it is the commonwealth of souls in Jesus Christ. . . . Christ's ministers in the Church are stewards in the household of God, and shepherds of His flock. Some are called and ordained to this sole occupation, and have a principal and directing part in these great duties; but they hold no priesthood differing in kind from that which is common to the Lord's people.' Cp. Bp. Gore's reference to St. Paul's anxiety 'to represent the whole body of the Church, and not only its officers, as the organ of the Spirit' (*The Holy Spirit and the Church*, p. 169). [See also Moberly, *Atonement and Personality*, pp. 91 ff., and C. Anderson Scott, in *The Spirit*, &c., pp. 151 ff.]

'*A.* 1. We are persuaded that the body of our hearers will, even after our death, remain in the Church, unless they be thrust out. 2. We believe notwithstanding, either that they will be thrust out, or that they will leaven the whole Church. 3. We do, and will do, all we can to prevent those consequences which are supposed likely to happen after our death. 4. But we cannot, with a good conscience, neglect the present opportunity of saving souls while we live, for fear of consequences which may possibly or probably happen after we are dead.'

The events which led up to Wesley's ordinations fall mainly into two categories: (1) those which show the increasing necessity for the administration of the Sacraments to the Methodist people, and (2) those which reveal the change of attitude to the theory of Apostolical Succession on the part of Wesley himself. The Societies, which had been led so far to adopt some system of church government, in face of the attitude of the Establishment, began in 1755 to demand in earnest the administration of the Sacraments, and the need for meeting the situation became increasingly obvious. Later, in America, there were large numbers of Methodists without the Sacraments for whom no adequate provision had been made, nor would be made, by the English bishops; and Wesley's observation, after ordaining Coke as Superintendent of American Methodism, runs thus: 'These are the steps which, not of choice but of necessity, I have slowly and deliberately taken. If any man is pleased to call this separating from the Church, he may.'[1] That this action was justified is surely plain from any consideration of the wonderful development of the Methodist work in America, as also in Great Britain and other parts of the world. It must be remembered, however, that Wesley's ordinations were not, on his part, a conscious break with the Church, since he was convinced that the power

[1] *Arminian Magazine*, 1785; quoted by Gregory, *Scriptural Church Principles*, &c., ii. p. 104. Considerations such as these probably induced the late Professor Swete, in a lecture at Cambridge, November 23, 1910, to affirm that the whole system of Wesleyanism is a product of modern life and radically different from the Primitive Church. On the other hand, Dr. John S. Simon (*The Revival of Religion in England in the Eighteenth Century*, p. 317) states that 'the United Societies were a restored picture of the Apostolic Church in the matters of doctrine, experience, and fellowship.' It must not be assumed that most of the Methodists 'separated from the Church.' Many had been Dissenters, some Roman Catholics most 'nothing.'

to ordain properly inhered in his position as a presbyter. A reference is found in his *Journal*, entered January 20, 1746, to a perusal of Lord King's *Account of the Primitive Church*. 'In spite of the vehement prejudice of my education,' he writes, 'I was ready to believe that this was a fair and impartial draught; but if so, it would follow that bishops and presbyters are (essentially) of one order.' The Methodist Conference of the following year, 1747, admitted that the three orders of bishops, priests, and deacons are described in the New Testament, and 'generally obtained in the churches of the Apostolic age.' It, however, declined to believe that God designed the same plan for 'all churches throughout all ages,' 'because,' it declared, 'we do not know that it is asserted in Holy Writ.' The question then arose: 'In what age was the Divine right of episcopacy asserted in England?' and received this answer: 'About the middle of Queen Elizabeth's reign. Till then the bishops and clergy of England continually allowed and joined in the ministration of those who were not episcopally ordained.'[1] Writing in the *Arminian Magazine* for November 1779, Wesley says: 'I still believe the episcopal form of church-government to be scriptural and apostolical; I mean, well agreeing with the practice and writing of the Apostles. But that it is *prescribed* in Scripture I do not believe. This opinion, which I once zealously espoused, I have been heartily ashamed of ever since I read Bishop Stillingfleet's *Irenicon*.'[2] Lord King's book also must have made a lasting impression on his mind, for he refers to it again in a letter (September 10, 1784) addressed 'to Dr. Coke, Mr. Asbury, and our Brethren in North America,' in which he observes: 'Lord King's *Account of the Primitive Church* convinced me many years ago that bishops and presbyters are the same order, and consequently have the same right to ordain.' Further, when, in the following year, his brother Charles expressed himself as shocked that he should 'assume the episcopal character, ordain elders, consecrate a bishop, and send him to ordain,' Wesley made answer: 'I firmly believe that I am a scriptural ἐπίσκοπος as much as any

1 Quoted by Dr. J. H. Rigg, *The Churchmanship of John Wesley*, pp. 60 ff., 67; also see William Myles, *A Chronological History of the People called Methodists* (1813).

2 See articles by Dr. H. B. Workman in *A New History of Methodism* (i. pp. 68 f.) and Rev. T. E. Brigden (i. pp. 229 ff.).

man in England or in Europe ; for the uninterrupted succession I know to be a fable, which no man ever did or can prove.' Some inconsistency has been charged against Wesley, if not a reversion to his High Church views, on account of his famous ' Korah ' sermon on *The Ministerial Office*, in which he inveighs against certain of his preachers who seemed anxious to exercise the functions of the priesthood, urging them to ' be content with preaching the Gospel.' This occurred in 1789, two years before his death. But his judgement on the validity of his own ordinations had undergone no change, for Dr. Rigg points out that, according to the undoubted testimony of Samuel Bradburn (one of his preachers, who became President of the Conference in 1799), he had consecrated one of his English preachers as ' bishop ' in the year immediately preceding. ' What he objected to in some of his preachers,' remarks Dr. Rigg, ' was that they had presumed to administer the Sacraments when he had not appointed them.' [1] The strictness with which Wesley confined the administration of the Sacraments to ordained men appeared to be succeeded after his death by a certain reserve concerning the whole question of ordination, the Conference of 1792 framing careful rules with regard to it,[2] and deciding (by lot, after prayer) ' that the Lord's Supper should not be administered in the Societies for that year.' The ' Plan of Pacification ' sanctioned by the Conference of 1795, by which ' the right to administer the Sacraments and to hold service in church hours was established,' [3] terminated a golden opportunity for the winning of Methodism, of which the English bishops did not take advantage.

As would be expected, all Wesley's own ordinations were by imposition of hands. The following entry in Richard What-

[1] Rigg, *The Churchmanship of John Wesley*, pp. 70 f. Moreover, in conversation with Henry Moore, another of his preachers, he thought it wisest to avoid any defence of the main position taken in the sermon.

[2] ' *Q.* What rules shall be made concerning Ordination ? '

' *A.* 1. No Ordination shall take place in the Methodist Connexion without the consent of the Conference previously obtained. 2. If any brother shall break the above-mentioned rule, by ordaining or being ordained, without the consent of the Conference previously obtained, the brother so breaking the rule does thereby exclude himself.'

Doubtless this was perfectly clear to Joseph Cownley and Charles Atmore, who ordained Alexander Kilham (leader of the first secession) that same year, so they deemed it advisable to add on Kilham's ordination certificate—' having been ourselves ordained by the late Rev. John Wesley and other ordained ministers.'

[3] *A New History of Methodism*, i. p. 386.

coat's Journal, under date September 1, 1784, is quoted in *A New History of Methodism* [1]: 'Rev. John Wesley, Thomas Coke, and James Creighton, presbyters of the Church of England, formed a presbytery and ordained Richard Whatcoat and Thomas Vasey deacons; and, on September 2, by the same hands, R. Whatcoat and T. Vasey were ordained elders, and Thomas Coke, LL.D., was ordained Superintendent for the Church of God under our care in North America.' Coke's ordination certificate, still extant in Wesley's handwriting, states: 'I have this day set apart, by the imposition of hands and prayer, being assisted by other ordained ministers, Thomas Coke, &c.' Between 1784 and 1789 other ordinations followed, authorizing preachers to administer the Sacraments in Scotland (1785), in Antigua (1786), and, in the case of Mather (also Superintendent, 1788), President of the Conference of 1792, Moore, and Rankin (1789), in England. In all, twenty-seven were so ordained, and these all were appointed 'to administer the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper according to the usages of the Church of England.' In the years immediately following Wesley's death, the custom was for the presbytery to ordain by the solemn lifting up of the hands, which was the method adopted by the Conference of 1793 in authorizing those preachers not already ordained to administer the Sacraments. Before long, however, this method began to receive criticism from the Anglican element in Methodism, and gradually, from 1814 onwards, the custom of ordaining by imposition of hands was resumed, first in the ordination of men for service abroad, then, in 1836, in all ordinations [2]; but it was understood that the *mode* of ordaining had in no wise affected the 'validity' of the rite in any single instance, since, in both ways equally, the Church's confirmation of the Holy Spirit's personal call [3] was conveyed with the utmost solemnity, and His reception by the ordinand unitedly petitioned. It is because Methodism has based her 'true and proper position

1 By Rev. T. E. Brigden, i. p. 231. This happened eight years after the Declaration of American Independence, the American Methodists being, in Wesley's words, 'now totally disentangled both from the State and from the English hierarchy.'

2 Partly in reply to the Oxford Tractarians.

3 'In the Apostolic Age, this benedictory imposition of hands was but the public recognition of an antecedent Divine call and qualification for office *already* imparted by the Holy Spirit.'—J. R. Cohu, *The Evolution of the Christian Ministry* (Modern Churchman's Library), pp. 17, 55.

as a Church '[1] on the fact of her having been called of God to do work in which His Spirit still honours her, that she also bases the validity of her ordinations on the proved fact of the Spirit's call to the individual as recognized by formal induction into the ministerial office,[2] not on any conveyance of special enabling grace.

Appended Note

An interesting series of lectures was delivered at Cambridge in the autumn of 1910 by the late Professor H. B. Swete on 'The Three Orders of the Ministry,' which bears upon certain points discussed in this chapter. He remarked that the term 'Holy Orders' does not occur in the New Testament. For the origin of this idea we have to look to the city life of the Roman Empire, where *ordo* was sometimes contrasted with *plebs*; so that, when a similar distinction was taken over into the Christian Church, the clergy became regarded as the *ordo* and the laity as the *plebs*. This distinction was no merely popular one; it was, as Tertullian tells us, made by the authority of the Church itself. The original Apostolate, Professor Swete continued, was the first Christian Holy Order instituted by Christ Himself. In 1 Tim. iii. 1, and Titus i. 7, the word 'bishop' was admitted as the synonym for presbyter; and, while at Philippi presbyters were called bishops already, at all other places the word points to a function of the presbyter's office. A similar situation is found in the *Didache*. In the *Epistles of Ignatius* the episcopate comes to light in a clear and developed position, in which the bishop, as a constitutional monarch, is separated very definitely from the presbyter. In those days when persecution either threatened or actually caused disintegration, Ignatius urges that nothing should be done without the bishop. Thus, according to Professor Swete, a monarchical episcopate existed within twenty years

[1] Declaration of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference of 1891.

[2] Winer, *Confessions of Christendom*, p. 353, states that 'most individual Protestant Churches attach the office of ordination to special superior functionaries only for the sake of order.' It may be observed that the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church of America are 'consecrated' to the office; but 'this service is not to be understood as an ordination to a higher order in the Christian ministry, beyond and above that of elders or presbyters, but as a solemn and fitting consecration for the special and most sacred duties of superintendency in the Church' (*Discipline*, § 449).

of the Apostolic Age, and is assumed by Ignatius as well established. 'We cannot allow less than twenty years for the establishment of the episcopate,' said the Professor, 'and twenty years back would connect the bishops with St. John directly, as Tertullian observes. Thus the rise of the monarchical episcopate was either due to St. John, or else he did not check it. It is reasonable to think that the episcopate began with St. John.' The suggestion was made that such was almost certainly the case, since Ignatius never speaks of presbyters as bishops, or *vice versa*. Whereas, therefore, the evidence for an early and wide extension of the episcopate in Asia Minor is considerable and definite, similar evidence in Europe is scanty. The early Roman bishops were rather chiefs of, than chiefs over, the presbyters, but by the fourth century every church had its bishop as apart from the presbyters, while ordination had been the sole prerogative of bishops generally in the course of the third century. Cyprian was only one of the Christian writers of those times who regarded the unity of the Universal Church, and also the unity of the faith, as guarded by the episcopate. From the status of bishop developed metropolitan, patriarch, and pope, in the course of the years.

The foregoing is full of interest as a reminder of how the separate episcopate grew up after New Testament times, very largely, as may be gathered from Ignatius, as a measure for promoting unity in face of danger. In the New Testament itself, however, as is generally recognized, 'the names "bishop" and "presbyter" were . . . of the same force and were used interchangeably': and, though 'the functions soon came to be distinguished clearly,'[1] Wesley's conclusions that bishops and presbyters are consequently of one and the same order in essence, and that therefore presbyters have a scriptural right to ordain, appear to be in full accord with all the facts of the case. 'Of an order of men holding an exclusive right to ordain elders, we find in the New Testament no trace.'[2] If, then, the separate episcopal order arose later on the ground of expediency, it may readily be granted that it was of the *bene esse* of the Church; but that it was, or could always be, of the very *esse* of the Church, in a succession apart from which no ordination

[1] Gavin, *Greek Orthodox Thought*, p. 247.
[2] J. Agar Beet, *The Church, the Churches, and the Sacraments*, p. 43 (and pp. 75 f.).

is valid, cannot be granted without the general consent of Christian scholarship, which certainly appears less and less likely to be given. The late Dr. H. M. Gwatkin, when Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Cambridge, once said to the present writer that Apostolical Succession *might* be true historically, but if so, he considered its spiritual value to be nil. Those who regard it as spiritually essential will naturally be concerned to vindicate their own unbroken connexion with it, and the late Professor Swete took pains to controvert the adverse judgement on the validity of Anglican Orders delivered in the Bull *Apostolicae Curae* by Pope Leo XIII.[1] It is at least beyond much question that, on *such* ground of debate, the advantage lies with the Roman Catholics ; and Cardinal Bourne, Archbishop of Westminster, in his Lenten Pastoral of 1925, confidently referred to ' the great Latin Church of the West ' as that ' with which we *alone* in England of to-day stand in a relation of unbroken continuity.' But this attitude, in assuming that the only permanent system of government intended for the Church, and the only channel of ordaining grace, is a separated episcopacy of whose existence the New Testament knows nothing, rests upon an exceedingly insecure foundation. Moreover, in so far as its logical outcome is to cause any present-day clergymen to be concerned about such questions as the due consecration of an Elizabethan Archbishop, as determining whether they are, or are not, properly commissioned by the Spirit of God, such an attitude is surely opposed to all that is known of the Mind of the Master.[2] It was Dr. Swete's belief that, while a *spiritual* ministry is known by its effects, spiritual results cannot be made the note of validity without confusion being caused. ' Spirituality is personal ; validity is official,' he declared. But is this sufficient warrant for setting genealogy before character as a test of ministerial validity ? What could be the value in the sight of God of an unspiritual validity ?—for ' if any man,' be he minister or layman, ' hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His ' (Rom. viii. 9). Similarly we may regard the question of the validity of a Church (in which the pure Word of God is preached and the Sacraments are duly

[1] In a lecture (1896) published by Bowes & Bowes, Cambridge.

[2] On November 23, 1910, the writer asked the late Professor Gwatkin what he thought of the validity of Nonconformist Orders. ' As good as mine,' he replied instantly.

administered) as being principally one of vitality ; for, if the Church Universal is ' the Body of *Christ*,' she will not give the impression that she exists for herself, but for the salvation of the world. In the words of Sir J. R. Seeley : ' When the power of reclaiming the lost dies out of the Church, it ceases to be the Church.' [1] The more all Christian Communions relate their beliefs to *life* and allow their conduct to be prompted by the Spirit of Life, the sooner will they ' *all* attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a fullgrown man ' (Eph. iv. 13). Only such a unity and fullness of growth, in which ' all the Body ' is ' fitly framed and knit together through that which *every* joint supplieth,' can be ' the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.'

[1] *Ecce Homo* (1908 ed.), p. 289.

XII

THE WORK OF THE SPIRIT IN THE SACRAMENTS

'Sunt sacramenta signa ac symbola visibilia rerum internarum et invisibilium, per quae ceu per media, Deus ipse virtute Spiritus sancti in nobis operatur.

BELGIC CONFESSION.

XII

THE WORK OF THE SPIRIT IN THE SACRAMENTS

I

THE seventeenth century found two opposing views of the Sacraments left by the sixteenth. The first was that which had been propounded and developed by the Schoolmen, and embodied later in Roman teaching at Trent, according to which the Sacraments are the only channel of Divine grace, and convey such grace *ex opere operato*.[1] The second was that which had been upheld by the Reformers, according to which the Sacraments of themselves neither justify nor sanctify, their spiritual effectiveness being dependent entirely on the operation of the Holy Spirit and the exercise of faith. The Greek Church, like the Roman, continued to observe seven Sacraments, its *Orthodox Confession* of 1643 making reference to *Ἑπτὰ μυστήρια τῆς ἐκκλησίας*. The Greek and Roman doctrines of the Sacraments are, indeed, very similar, the principal difference being that the Greeks attribute to the Holy Spirit that which the Romanists attribute to the rite itself. The Sacraments, so the Greeks insist, are the means by which grace is actually bestowed by the Holy Spirit[2]; while it is by the power of the Holy Spirit (*διὰ τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος* —*Conf. Orth.*) that transubstantiation, also an article of Greek belief, takes place in the Eucharist.[3] Yet, on account of this very belief, following on the belief that baptism destroys original sin, the need for faith on the part of the communicant receives comparatively little emphasis, while the character of the officiating priest does not arise. The Greeks, it may be added,

1 This was later on challenged by Jansenism, Antoine Arnauld († 1694), in his *De la Fréquente Communion* (1643), inveighing against the whole conception.

2 *ὁ ἱερεὺς ἁγιάζει τὸ μυστήριον τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος.—Conf. Orth.*

3 Also, Winer thus quotes Jeremias (*Confessions of Christendom*, p. 282): *Δοξάζει ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία, ὅτι μετὰ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν ὁ μὲν ἄρτος μεταβάλλεται εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ δὲ οἶνος εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ αἷμα, διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου.*

assert that the Sacraments of the Orthodox Church alone are valid, since through them only is grace bestowed or the Holy Spirit given.[1]

French and English Protestantism in general follow the lead of the Reformers, though differences occur among the later Protestants even as they occurred among the Reformers themselves. Cameron lays stress on the Spirit's work in the Sacraments,[2] Hooker emphasizes the Sacraments but not the work of the Spirit in relation thereto, disagreements manifest themselves between Anglican and Puritan divines in the course of the seventeenth century. Quakerism, as is well known, has never seen any necessity for Sacraments, believing that, since God communicates with men directly by His Spirit, any other communication through outward forms is unnecessary. The baptism which is now required is, it is held, the baptism not of water, but of the Holy Spirit,[3] while there is no warrant to be found in Scripture for the observance of the Lord's Supper in all ages.[4] A perusal of Wesley's writings gives the impression that he clothed much of his more mature thinking on the Sacraments with High Church expressions, and that he actually leaned somewhat in the direction of High Church views toward the close of his life. Certainly he was constant in his insistence on the Sacraments, and for this there was special need when Moravian teaching began to belittle all good works, the Sacraments included. Methodism, following the example of its founder in the importance which it attaches to due observance of the Sacraments, regards baptism as symbolic of the inner working of the regenerating Spirit, and the Lord's Supper as not only a memorial but also a means of grace, used as such by the Holy Spirit wherever a living faith responds.[5] 'The presence of Christ through His Spirit in the Sacraments is realized by the faith of His people.'[6]

[1] Gavin, *Greek Orthodox Thought*, pp. 263, 292.

[2] *Second Sermon* on John vi. 56.

[3] See also Barclay's *Apology*, prop. 12.

[4] Barclay's *Catechism*. See also the *Apology*, prop. 13, which follows on his teaching concerning the inner spiritual Body of Christ.

[5] Cf. Pope, *Compendium*, iii. p. 309: 'There is nothing ordained by our Lord for the permanent observance of His people which is not accompanied by the Holy Ghost, and made the channel of its own appropriate grace.'

[6] *Statement of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference*, 1908.

II

The Eastern Church unites with the Roman in acknowledging baptismal regeneration,[1] but regards as the source of the efficacy of baptism 'the invocation of the Holy Trinity,' rather than the priestly administration of the rite itself.[2] This ordinance, which is therefore necessary to salvation,[3] is followed by the Sacrament of Chrism, or Confirmation, at the hands of the bishop, in which the gift of the Holy Spirit is bestowed;[4] and those who receive this 'seal' (*σφραγὶς δωρεᾶς πνεύματος*) are made partakers of the Holy Spirit (*μέτοχοι τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος*). On the other hand, the Arminians, while rejecting any idea of baptismal regeneration, are not unlike Calvin in regarding baptism as not simply a profession of entry into the Christian Church, but as a symbol of the reception of Divine grace.[5] This, as may be inferred, primarily concerns adult baptism, and resembles the *via media* found in English theology. Andrewes believes baptism to be a form used by the Holy Spirit in conveying regenerating grace to the soul, 'and,' he adds, 'better not born at all than not so born again.'[6] Cartwright declines to go so far, but baptism is to him plainly more than simply the form of entering the Christian Society. The Lord's Commission as recorded in Matt. xxviii. is, he suggests, clear proof of this. 'Baptism,' he comments, 'is here a solemn token (*tessera*) and symbol (*sigillum*) by which it is left on record that believers . . . are received and included in the Communion and Society of the one true God—of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. For, since baptism seals our unity with Christ, whom we put on (Rom. xiii. 14), and Christ is of one Essence together with the Father and the Holy Spirit, it follows that in baptism we are declared to be adopted (*insitos*) and received (*ascitos*) into God Himself.'[7] So the *Westminster Confession* asserts that in baptism 'the

1 *τὸ βάπτισμα . . . σφραγὶς τῆς σωτηρίας.*—*Conf. Orth.*

2 Gavin, *Greek Orthodox Thought*, p. 310.

3 *οἱ βαπτισθέντες γίνουνται μέλη τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν ἐνδυόμεθα.*—*Conf. Orth.* See Gavin, *ibid.*, p. 312.

4 *Τὸ δεύτερον μυστήριον εἶναι τὸ μύρον τοῦ χρίσματος, τὸ ὁποῖον ἤρχισεν ἀπὸ τὸν καιρὸν ὅπου τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκατάβηκεν εἰς τοὺς ἀποστόλους.*—*Conf. Orth.* See Gavin, *ibid.* pp. 316 ff.

5 *Confession of the Remonstrants*, xxiii. 3.

6 *Sermon 8 on the Holy Spirit* (Lk. iii. 21, 22).

7 *Harmonia Evangelica, ad loc.*

grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost to such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto.' The Zwinglian position that the rite signifies merely a sign of Christian witness and of adoption into God's family was a swing of the pendulum to the other extreme which did not greatly appeal even to seventeenth-century Puritanism. At the same time, the *Westminster Confession* makes it clear in the same Article that the bestowal of grace in baptism is not unconditional, as *always* accompanying the administration of this Sacrament, or as *necessarily* involving the 'renewing of the Holy Spirit.' 'Although it be a great sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance, yet grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto it as that no person can be regenerated or saved without it, or that all that are baptized are undoubtedly regenerated.'[1] Moreover, adds Lightfoot, such a text as Acts ii. 38 does not mean 'that every one that was baptized was presently endued with these extraordinary gifts of tongues and prophecy . . . but Peter inviteth them unto baptism, and then should they be *capable* of those gifts; and no doubt they were bestowed upon some of them by the Apostles' hands.'[2] This, he holds, gives no sanction to what is termed 'the strange rite of Confirmation' any more than does Acts viii. 17; for here, again, 'the imposition of the Apostles' hands was not upon all the Samaritans, but upon some selected number; nor upon those selected ones for their confirmation in grace, but for their ordination to the ministry.' The passage accordingly refers to certain extraordinary gifts of the Spirit being bestowed for this particular purpose. This was not a general gift of the Spirit to all, he repeats, for in this case it would have been granted to Simon Magus, and, so he quaintly observes, 'it would bring women under imposition of hands, which can hardly be dreamed of.' 'It is true, indeed,' he continues, 'that women might and did receive some of these extraordinary gifts, but it was by immediate influence from heaven, and not by any imposition of hands.'[3]

Rejection of the dogma of baptismal regeneration is voiced also by Nonconformist divines such as Owen, Henry, and Priestley. Regarding regeneration, 'the internal renovation

[1] xxviii. 6. [2] *Commentary on Acts, ad loc* [3] *Ibid.*

of the Holy Ghost is required thereunto,' writes Owen.[1] A note of Matthew Henry's on Matt. xxviii. 19, in his *Exposition of the New Testament*, runs thus: 'By our being baptized, we solemnly profess (1) Our assent to the Scripture revelation concerning God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. We confess our belief that there is a God, that there is but one God, that in the Godhead there is a Father that begets, a Son that is begotten, and a Holy Spirit of Both. We are baptized not into the "names," but into the "name" of Father, Son, and Spirit, which plainly intimates that these Three are One, and Their Name One. The distinct mentioning of the three Persons in the Trinity, both in the Christian baptism here, and in the Christian blessing (2 Cor. xiii. 14), as it is a full proof of the Trinity, so it has done much toward preserving of it pure and entire through all ages of the Church. . . . (2) Our consent to a covenant relation to God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.' Here is simply confession, together with a willing acceptance of a new personal relationship. Priestley, again, cannot agree with baptismal regeneration, as if some 'Divine virtue' attends the administration of this rite. 'In the age immediately following that of the Apostles,' he writes, 'we find that baptism and regeneration were used as synonymous terms; and whereas, originally, the pardon of sin was supposed to be the consequence of that reformation of life which was only *promised* at baptism, it was now imagined that there was something in the *rite itself* to which that grace was annexed.'[2] Confirmation, too, in Priestley's opinion, has no scriptural warrant. It 'is evidently a remainder of the popish Sacrament of Confirmation.' 'This imposition of hands [on the part of the bishop] was,' he declares, 'the province of the Apostles only, and not that of the bishop. This custom of reserving the imposition of hands after baptism, to be performed by the bishop alone, seems to have been begun in the time of Jerome, but he himself did not think that the Holy Spirit was given by the imposition of the hands of the bishops only.'[3] Probably it was on account of the growing need, which these later Nonconformists felt, of refuting baptismal regenera-

[1] *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, p. 513. A Baptist Confession drawn up in 1677 likewise rejects baptismal regeneration, laying down that candidates for baptism must exercise repentance and faith before being admitted to the ordinance.

[2] *Corruptions of Christianity*, ii. pp. 79, 94.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 99.

tion, that they had much less to say about the connexion between baptism and the Holy Spirit's bestowal of grace.

Reference has already been made to Wesley's use of High Church expressions, an example of which occurs in his *Treatise on Baptism* (1758), in which he speaks of baptism as 'the ordinary instrument of our justification.' 'By baptism,' he says, 'we are admitted into the Church, and consequently made members of Christ, its Head. For "as many as are baptized into Christ," in His name, "have thereby put on Christ" (Gal. iii. 27)—that is, are mystically united to Christ and made one with Him. For "by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body" (1 Cor. xii. 13)—namely, "the Church, the Body of Christ." From which spiritual vital union with Him proceeds the influence of His grace on those that are baptized.' Again, 'The terms, of being regenerated, of being born again, of being born of God—in Scripture—always express an inward work of the Spirit, whereof baptism is the outward sign': also, 'the outward sign duly received is always accompanied with the inward grace.'[1] Further, Wesley's comment on Acts xxii. 16, in the *Notes on the New Testament*, reads: 'Baptism, administered to real penitents, is both a means and seal of pardon. Nor did God ordinarily in the primitive Church bestow this on any, unless through this means.' There is little ground for believing, however, that Wesley adhered to the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, as commonly understood, any more than did the Puritans of the seventeenth century whose expressions as touching grace and reception into Christ have been briefly noticed above. That baptism is an outward sign of an inward work of the Spirit had been held by Arminius on the Continent and also by Puritans in the English Church; it was also an accepted belief among the early Methodists.[2] Moreover, no notion of baptismal regeneration is essentially bound up with the statement that 'the outward sign duly received is always accompanied with the inward grace'; for the word 'duly,' which may without

[1] *J. Wesley in company with High Churchmen*, pp. 6 ff., by 'An Old Methodist' (1870).

[2] Jonathan Crowther, *History of the Wesleyan Methodists* (1815), p. 228: 'The Methodists believe baptism to be . . . not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible Church, but also to be to him a sign or emblem of regeneration.'

strain be referred to preliminary repentance and faith on the part of the person about to be baptized, sufficiently excludes it. The Church of England, as Wesley observes in his sermon on 'The New Birth,' regards 'baptism, the sign,' as 'distinct from regeneration, the thing signified.'[1] His reference to Acts xxii. 16, where it is clear that he has adult baptism exclusively in mind, containing as it does the words 'ordinarily in the primitive Church,' makes it clear that he does not regard baptism as a means to this end for all persons in all ages. As Dr. Rigg points out,[2] in the twenty-five Articles of Religion which Wesley published in 1784, instead of the Thirty-nine, he affirms, in the Article on Baptism, that this Sacrament is 'a sign of regeneration, or the new birth'; but omits the words which follow in the Anglican Article—'whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the Church,' &c. This shows, in Dr. Rigg's words, that 'henceforth the Sacraments, according to his teaching, were to be regarded only as means and seals of grace, not as fountains of supernatural power, ministered by the hand of the priest.'[3] Wesley's Sermons confirm such a conclusion with no uncertainty. In that on 'The New Birth' he remarks: 'As the New Birth is not the same thing with baptism, so it does not always accompany baptism: they do not constantly go together. A man may possibly be "born of water," and yet not be born "of the Spirit." There may sometimes be the outward sign where there is not the inward grace.' In that on 'The Marks of the New Birth,' he allows that children are made by baptism 'children of God, and heirs of the kingdom of heaven'; but, he insists, 'the question is not, What you were made in baptism; but, What are you now?' Then follows a forceful passage well known to students of Wesley: 'Say not then in your heart, I *was once* baptized, therefore I *am now* a child of God. Alas, that consequence will by no means hold. How many are the baptized gluttons and drunkards, the baptized liars and common swearers, the baptized railers and evil-speakers, the baptized whoremongers, thieves, extortioners? What think you? Are these now the children

1 Cp. John S. Simon, *Revival of Religion in England in the Eighteenth Century*, p. 18: 'In the Ancient Church . . . it was not to regenerate a man that he was baptized; he was baptized because he was regenerated.'

2 *The Churchmanship of John Wesley* (1878), pp. 43 f. 3 *Ibid.*, p. 40.

of God? Verily, I say unto you, whosoever you are, unto whom any one of the preceding characters belong, "Ye are of your father the Devil, and the works of your father ye do." ' Similarly, in *A Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion* (pt. i. i. 5), he writes: 'I tell a sinner, "You must be born again." "No," say you: "he was born again in baptism. Therefore he cannot be born again now." Alas! what trifling is this! What if he was then a child of God? He is now manifestly a child of the Devil; for the works of his father he doeth. Therefore, do not play upon words. He must go through an entire change of heart.' 'To say then,' concludes Wesley,[1] 'that there is no new birth but in baptism, is to seal you all under damnation.'[2] Thus the line of demarcation was drawn very clearly between the two systems, one of which viewed the Christian life as beginning at baptism, and the other which viewed it as beginning at conversion. Crowther indicates the standpoint of early Methodism in the observation that, 'though baptism ought not to be neglected, grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto or connected with it, as that no person can be regenerated or saved without it, or that all who are baptized are certainly regenerated.'[3] But he indicates the same standpoint equally when he asserts baptism to be 'a sign or emblem of regeneration,' and 'a covenant of grace'; and his words quoted above were intended simply to safeguard this Sacrament from what was regarded as an extreme interpretation, not to evacuate it of its solemn scriptural significance.[4]

[1] *Sermon* on 'The Marks of the New Birth.'

[2] Contrast the conclusion of Bishop Gore (*The Holy Spirit and the Church*, p. 14), drawn from Acts ii. 38, that 'to the reception of the Spirit there is no gate but baptism in the name of the Lord Jesus.'

[3] Crowther, *History of the Wesleyan Methodists*, p. 229, where he follows the *Westminster Confession* almost word for word.

[4] Later Methodist belief is expressed by Dr. Pope, *Compendium of Christian Theology*, iii. p. 311: 'Baptism is an ordinance appointed by our Lord to be the rite of initiation into the new covenant of grace and fellowship of its Kingdom; being the sign and seal of the blessings of that covenant conferred upon those who thereby avow their acceptance of the one condition of faith in Jesus Christ with its obligations. It is the Sacrament of union with Christ, of pardon and renewal through His Gospel, and of membership in His Church: being the outward and visible sign of the sealing of the Holy Ghost, who is the interior Bond of Communion between the believer and the Lord; the Agent in imparting that forgiveness and regeneration of which the washing of water is the sign.' It is therefore both the sign of the covenant and its seal, which pledges the covenant blessings 'to all who believe and dedicate their children to Christ' (*ibid.*, p. 324).

III

The transubstantiation of the whole substance of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, which both the Greek and Roman Churches believe to take place in the consecration of the elements at the Eucharist, is held by the Greeks to be due solely to the instrumentality of the Holy Spirit.[1] It may be recalled that Radbertus, who first propounded the dogma of transubstantiation in the West, also announced it as a work of the Holy Spirit; 'nevertheless, such a theory cannot from its very content allow much scope to the work of the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist, for its commitment to the real presence of Christ's Body from the moment of the consecration of the elements serves only to obscure Christ's real presence by His Spirit.'[2] There is little to record here with regard to the Reformed Churches, for, while the Lord's Supper was the principal subject of debate during the sixteenth century, it hardly emerges even as a secondary subject of debate during the seventeenth and eighteenth, perhaps for the very reason that no new point was found to be discussed. Calvin again passes on to the Church of later days the doctrine of the *via media*, by which the Holy Spirit is set forth as the Medium of Divine grace at the Eucharist, incorporating with Christ those communicants who approach the Table of the Lord with faith. Arminianism inclines more to the lead which had been given by Zwingli, emphasizing the Holy Supper as a memorial first and foremost; but it advances beyond the Zwinglian position in that it speaks of the Supper also as a test of faith and a solemn thanksgiving, imparting spiritual nourishment and strengthening spiritual fellowship.[3] The

[1] *Conf. Orth.*: αὐτὴ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ οἴνου μεταβάλλεται εἰς τὴν οὐσίαν τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ διὰ τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος Similarly the *Confession of Dositheus*. See Gavin, *ibid.*, pp. 331 ff., 345.

[2] *The Holy Spirit in the Mediaeval Church*, p. 345.

[3] *Conf. Remonstr.*, xxiii. 4: 'Sancta coena est alter Novi Testamenti sacer ritus, a Jesu Christo ea qua proditus fuit nocte institutus, ad celebrandum eucharisticam et solennem mortis suae commemorationem, in quo fideles, postquam se ipsos explorarunt inque vera fide approbarunt, sacrum panem in coetu publice fractum edunt et simul vinum publice fusum bibunt, idque ad cruentam domini mortem pro nobis obitam (qua sicut corpora nostra cibo et potu seu pane et vino sustentantur, ita corda nostra in spem vitae aeternae aluntur et nutriuntur) cum solenni gratiarum actione annuntiandum, suamque vicissim cum crucifixo Christi corpore et effuso sanguine (sive cum ipso Jesu Ch. pro nobis crucifixo et mortuo), eoque beneficiis omnibus per mortem J. C. partis atque acquisitis, vivificam et spiritualem communionem et mutuam simul inter se caritatem coram deo et ecclesia publice testificandam.'

Westminster Confession, on the other hand, abides more by Calvin's position, regarding the Eucharist as a seal of grace and a channel of Divine blessing, made effective for believers by 'the work of the Spirit and the word of institution' (xxvii. 3). 'Worthy receivers, outwardly partaking of the visible elements in this Sacrament, do then also inwardly by faith, really and indeed, yet not carnally and corporally, but spiritually, receive and feed upon Christ crucified, and all benefits of His death: the body and blood of Christ being then not corporally or carnally in, with, or under the bread and wine; yet as really, but spiritually, present to the faith of believers in that ordinance, as the elements themselves are to their outward senses' (xxix. 7). The Westminster divines further express their conviction that, while this Sacrament could not be invalidated by defective morality in the case of any officiating minister, it could be invalidated by sin in the communicant, which would hinder the work of the Spirit in the heart.[1]

In the opinion of so high a Methodist authority as the late Dr. J. H. Rigg, Wesley's outlook on the subject of the Lord's Supper was that of a Broad Churchman. Though, as Dr. Rigg observes, Wesley 'became in the last few years of his life more Anglican in his feelings than he had been at perhaps any time since his conversion,'[2] this does not mean that he ever adopted a 'high' doctrine of the Eucharist, even if, here and there, a word or a phrase may seem to suggest it. He takes over into his Twenty-five Articles of Religion the Anglican Article, 'Of the Lord's Supper,' without alteration, and his pronouncements concerning this Sacrament follow the *via media*, or the Reformed faith as embodied in the Anglican standards. 'All who desire an increase of the grace of God are to wait for it in partaking of the Lord's Supper: for this also is a direction Himself hath given. . . . And that this is also an ordinary, stated means of receiving the grace of God, is evident from those words of the Apostle . . . (1 Cor. x. 16). Is not the eating of that bread, and the drinking of that cup, the outward visible means, whereby God conveys into our

[1] Cp. C. W. Emmet, in *The Spirit*, &c., p. 173: 'Psychologically the worshipper cannot respond so readily if he is conscious that the rite which should be instinct with the personality of Christ is performed by one whose whole life is un-Christlike.'

[2] *The Churchmanship of John Wesley*, p. 46.

souls all that spiritual grace, that righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost, which were purchased by the body of Christ once broken, and the blood of Christ once shed for us? Let all, therefore, who truly desire the grace of God, eat of that bread, and drink of that cup.' But that in this same sermon, on 'The Means of Grace,' it might be clear that a living relationship with Christ, by His Spirit, is essential, Wesley adds: 'Settle this in your heart, that the *opus operatum*, the mere *work done*, profiteth nothing; that there is no *power* to save, but in the Spirit of God, no *merit*, but in the Blood of Christ; that, consequently, even what God ordains, conveys no grace to the soul, if you trust not in Him alone. On the other hand, he that does truly trust in Him, cannot fall short of the grace of God, even though he were cut off from every outward ordinance, though he were shut up in the centre of the earth.' A quotation has been made [1] from the *Journal*, where Wesley speaks of the Lord's Supper as ordained by God to be a means of conveying to men justifying grace, as evidence that his standpoint closely resembled that of the High Churchmen of his day in the emphasis which they laid upon the Sacraments as the ordinary instruments of justification. Not only, however, is this disproved by Wesley's treatment of the meaning of Baptism: the same quotation from the *Journal*, when read in its context, proves the very opposite, namely that his evangelism embraced the Lord's Supper as 'a converting ordinance,' wherein sinners could receive the Lord Himself by a living faith.[2] Indeed, his sermon on 'The Means of Grace' contains a paragraph which describes certain means by which 'a stupid, senseless wretch' is brought by God to salvation, at the close of which we read: 'Here he observes others go up to the Table of the Lord. He considers, Christ has said, "Do this!" How is it that I do not? I am too great a sinner. I am not fit. I am not worthy.[3] After

1 By 'An Old Methodist,' *John Wesley in company with High Churchmen*, pp. 20 and 79.

2 See a valuable paper by Principal T. H. Barratt in the *London Quarterly Review* (July 1923), on 'The Place of the Lord's Supper in Early Methodism' (pp. 68 ff.).

3 'What! Unworthy to obey God? . . . Who told you so? . . . Here [in 1 Cor. xi. 29] is not a word said of being unworthy to eat and drink. Indeed he does speak of eating and drinking unworthily; but that is quite a different thing.'—*Sermon* on 'The Duty of Constant Communion.' (Mr. Barratt's paper is an illuminating commentary on this sermon, pp. 56 ff., *ibid.*)

struggling with these scruples awhile, he breaks through. And thus he continues in God's way, in hearing, reading, meditating, praying, and partaking of the Lord's Supper, till God, in the manner that pleases Him, speaks to his heart, "Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace."' Such is not 'sacramental justification' as ordinarily understood, available only for those who are confirmed, or already converted: it is an extension of the evangelical position.[1]

When in the year 1815 Crowther published his *History of the Wesleyan Methodists*, he was able to state with a considerable degree of definiteness the creed of the Methodist Societies with reference to this Sacrament. 'The Methodists believe that [the Lord's Supper] ought to be observed by the Church to the end of the world, in remembrance of Christ's sacrifice of Himself in His death and passion, for the spiritual benefit of believers; to engage them more strongly to love and serve Him; as a bond of union among themselves; and as a sign of their mutual trust in and love to Christ; and of their mutual hope of being with Him hereafter. . . . All true Christians have fellowship with Him, especially in this ordinance, as to His grace, sufferings, death, resurrection, and glory.'[2] This reveals a resemblance to the Arminian interpretation; but, while there is a noticeable reserve as touching any 'conveyance of grace' in the Lord's Supper, such reserve cannot properly be pressed into a departure from the essentials of Wesley's teaching. To the followers of Wesley, the Supper of the Lord is a 'feeding on Christ in the heart by faith with thanksgiving,' a solemn realization of fellowship in His Body, a feast in which the covenant is renewed and the covenant-blood applied. It is, in Dr. Pope's language, 'a sign to the believing Church of all the blessings purchased by the oblation of the one sacrifice for sins, and a seal to the believer of his constant and present interest in those blessings. . . . That which the sign represents and the seal pledges is a benefit proceeding from Christ which must not be separated from

[1] At the same time, this same comparison gives rise to the suggestion that it may well be that, through a further development of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit on both sides, 'Sacramentarians' and Evangelicals may be brought nearer together.

[2] pp. 229 f.

Christ Himself. It is not the Holy Spirit save as He is the Spirit of Jesus.' [1]

[1] *Compendium*, iii. p. 334. The Order for the administration of the Lord's Supper as authorized for use in the Wesleyan Methodist Church, which differs but slightly from the Anglican Order, sufficiently confirms the above observations, e.g.: 'Grant us therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink His Blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His Body, and our souls washed through His most precious Blood, and that we may evermore dwell in Him, and He in us.' 'Grant that we, receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine . . . may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood.' 'Humbly beseeching Thee, that all we who are partakers of this Holy Communion, may be fulfilled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction.' This is very much more than a memorial.

XIII

THE SPIRIT AND THE HUMAN WILL

'Our wills are ours, we know not how;
Our wills are ours, to make them Thine.'

TENNYSON.

XIII

THE SPIRIT AND THE HUMAN WILL

I

'PROGRESS in the higher life requires two elements: the resolute setting of the will of man upon what is right, and the aiding of man's will by the will of God.'[1] But questions as to the relation of the will of man to the Spirit of God in the work of redemption continued to arise and to receive different answers. Both the Greek and the Roman Churches assert the existence of a bias toward evil, or 'original' sin, on the part of fallen man,[2] though the Greek Church in particular denies any suggestion of 'total depravity' in the sense that any power to will the good is entirely absent. The Greeks believe that man is first of all prompted by the Holy Spirit to accept salvation, and that he is absolutely free either to accept or to reject it. The Roman Church has a doctrine of prevenient grace in which, as among the Greeks, the co-operation of the Holy Spirit in conversion is definitely taught; but it assigns a larger part to the Holy Spirit in this connexion, and a correspondingly smaller part to the will, than do the Greeks, who attach a saving merit to good works. Such, at least, appears to be not an unfair comparison of the respective views of the two ancient Churches of Christendom as they are found within this period.

It is, however, within the bounds of Western Protestantism that most of the divergences of opinion occur. Luther had affirmed the utter impotence of the human will, declaring that the Holy Spirit is the sole cause of salvation. Melanchthon, followed by the Reformed Churches generally, had recognized the essential nature of the Spirit's work in salvation both in inducing the will to exercise saving faith and in enabling it

1 Dr. Percy Gardner, *The Practical Basis of Christian Belief*, p. 65.

2 *Conf. Orth.*: ἡ θέλησις ἔκλινε περισσότερον εἰς τὸ κακόν, παρὰ εἰς τὸ καλόν. See Gavin, *Greek Orthodox Thought*, pp. 220 ff. Winer, *Confessions*, p. 153, shows that, while the *Conf. Orth.* upholds the assistance of the Holy Spirit, Jeremias will have it that man can himself begin his own renewal; but Dositheus disagrees.

so to do, at the same time insisting that the will is free to respond and to co-operate.[1] The majority of the Reformers had to admit the will as a great factor in the renewal of the soul, side by side with the provision of the 'religious impulse' by the Divine Spirit. This debate between the advocates of monergism and synergism was closed by the *Formula of Concord*, which, belying its name, reimposed the Lutheran position, pronouncing that the will, either in its natural or its spiritualized[2] state, has no power of co-operation with the Spirit of God, corrupted as it has been by the inward ravages of sin.[3] The situation for the human soul is, however, more encouraging in the *Formula* than it had appeared to be in the writings of Flacius, the Lutheran protagonist; and its signatories protest against his belief that original sin is part of human nature itself, since 'in a case of leprosy the leprous body and the leprosy itself in the body are not one and the same—if we would correctly and distinctly separate the one from the other.' The distinction between our Divinely created nature and the original sin which lurks within that nature must always be retained. But so also must the sorrowful truth of the existence of original sin, which renders inoperative any power of the will toward the good apart from the assistance of the Holy Spirit. 'Before a man is illumined, converted, regenerated, and influenced by the Holy Spirit, he can, of himself or his own natural powers, begin nothing in the spiritual realm either with a view to conversion or regeneration, nor can he operate or co-operate any more than a stone, a stock, or dirt.' On the other hand, he can easily take steps himself toward evil, so 'hindering the ordinary method of the Holy Spirit,' and making impossible his predestination to grace. 'It follows, when first the Holy Spirit, through the Word and the Sacraments, has begun His work of regeneration and renewal within us, that then, indeed, through the power (*virtus*) of the Holy Spirit, we can and must co-operate, though

1 *The Holy Spirit in the Mediaeval Church*, p. 350.

2 *Re* the suggestion of Chemnitz, 'that the will co-operates with the Holy Spirit only in so far as it has lost its natural state on becoming spiritualized by Him' (*ibid.*).

3 'Credimus, peccatum originis non esse levem, sed tam profundam humanae naturae corruptionem, quae nihil sanum, nihil incorruptum in corpore et anima hominis, atque adeo in interioribus et exterioribus viribus eius, reliquit . . . Itaque iam post lapsum homo haereditario a parentibus accipit congenitam pravam vim, internam immunditiem cordis, pravas concupiscentias et pravas inclinationes.'

much weakness comes in besides.' This co-operation, the *Formula* proceeds to say, arises out of those new powers and gifts vouchsafed by the Holy Spirit at conversion, and is maintained as it continues to arise out of them.[1] The belief 'that man can make any beginning towards doing good, and towards his own conversion, by means of his own natural powers,' is rejected as 'an error of Papists and Schoolmen.' 'Again, the dogma of the Synergists is rejected, who suppose that, in spiritual matters, man is not absolutely dead to the good, but only sorely wounded or half dead,' and that, after the Holy Spirit has made a beginning, man can co-operate with Him in order to his salvation in virtue of his own powers. 'Against this error it has been already shown that the power (*facultas*) of responding (*applicandi se*) to grace comes, not from our own natural strength, but only from the operation of the Holy Spirit.' Similar judgement was delivered by the *Canons of Dort*, which were intended to end the controversy concerning predestination. Like the *Formula of Concord*, they ended nothing, and merely gave an impulse to the cause of Calvinism. Calvinism, indeed, left very little for the human will to do. The main drift of the *Canons* is that, while all people deserve condemnation, God can grant, quite justifiably, saving faith to those whom He chooses; much in the same manner as the householder concluded the argument with those who had been labouring in the vineyard by saying, 'Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own?' The *Canons* observe that man, originally created as he was in the image of God, with holy affections, of his own free will rebelled against and deserted God, setting himself against God in heart and will, thus depriving himself of the Divine gifts which he had enjoyed.[2] 'All men are conceived in sin, and are born sons of wrath, incapable of adhering to anything that is good, disposed to evil, dead in sins, and the slaves of sin; and without the grace of the regenerating Holy Spirit they neither desire nor are able to return to God, to amend

1 'Postquam enim Sp. s. hoc ipsum iam operatus est atque effecit, hominisque voluntatem sola sua divina virtute et operatione immutavit atque renovavit, tunc revera hominis nova illa voluntas instrumentum est Dei Spiritus sancti, ut ea non modo gratiam apprehendat, verum etiam in operibus sequentibus Spiritui sancto co-operetur.' Again—'hoc ipsum non a nostra voluntate aut a viribus nostris proficiscitur, sed Sp. s. operatur in nobis illud velle et perficere.'

2 iii. 1.

their depraved nature, or to incline to His amendment of it.' [1] In other words, men have, by nature, only the power of resisting Divine mercy. Everything else affecting the whole subject of salvation must be attributed to the Holy Spirit. It is of interest to notice that the *Canons* concede a little to the compromise put forward by Chemnitz, and allow that *baptized* persons can co-operate in a measure with the Holy Spirit in their conversion ; but this was not regarded as the same as allowing (as most of the Synergists had done) a co-operation of the will by *nature*. The power of willing the good is restored fully to the natural man solely by the operation of the Spirit of God, this very operation being directed in accordance with Divine election.

Professor Moberly has pointed out that penitence signifies the presence in the heart of Spirit—not the person's own, as if of himself, and yet his very own, since the Spirit of God more and more dominates his own spirit. If, then, we may conceive complete domination as meaning, at least in practice, an identification of the Spirit of God with the spirit of man, so that, in Moberly's thought, the spirit of human contrition is the Spirit of holiness breaking sin within the kingdom of sin, some support may be found for the position taken by both the *Formula* and the *Canons*. And, to a certain extent, the Arminians are in agreement. Their *Remonstrance*, in the third article, states that man cannot exercise saving faith nor perform good works of himself ; ' but that it is needful that he be born again of God in Christ, through His Holy Spirit, and renewed in understanding, inclination, or will, and all his powers, in order that he may rightly understand, think, will, and achieve what is really good.' The fifth article adds that those who by faith have become one with Christ are fully empowered to fight and to conquer evil, ' it being well understood that it is always by the assisting grace of the Holy Spirit.' At the same time, Arminian theology, as systematized by Episcopius, asserts that Divine sovereignty and human freedom are not incompatible, and that, while the grace of the Holy Spirit is necessary to originate and help forward good

[1] ' Omnes homines in peccato concipiuntur, et filii irae nascuntur, inepti ad omne bonum salutare, propensi ad malum, in peccatis mortui, et peccati servi ; et, absque Spiritus sancti regenerantis gratia, ad Deum redire, naturam depravatam corrigere, vel ad eius correctionem, se disponere nec volunt, nec possunt.'—iii. 3.

works, salvation is bound to depend on man's response. By a prevenient operation of this grace, the natural will is 'awakened'—to use Limborch's term,[1] and enabled to co-operate fully, but man remains master of his own desires.[2] Grace is thus not the only cause of salvation, though it is certainly the primary cause; and, as such, it is granted to all mankind universally. Perhaps it was to be expected that the immediate effect of such teaching on the minds of Calvinists generally would be to draw down on the heads of the Arminians the charge of Semi-Pelagianism, or belief in a certain power in the will of unprompted goodness, to be aided of necessity by the Holy Spirit; but the charge of Pelagianism, or belief in an inherent bias towards the good, in connexion with which the assistance of the Holy Spirit is non-essential,—a charge which some extreme Calvinists did not hesitate to prefer—was totally without excuse. On the other hand, Saumur theology, following the lead of Cameron and Amyraut, designates the intellect, rather than the will, as the specific object of the Spirit's influence. The Spirit is here regarded as assisting in the work of grace by infusing knowledge into the mind, and it is to the mind as thus enriched that He makes His appeal. Pajon, who had once been a professor at Saumur, developed the theory that salvation depends on the whole combination of external circumstances which are allowed by God to affect any given individual, but his views carried comparatively little weight.

In England the *Westminster Confession*, reflecting as it did the convinced Calvinism of the Presbyterians of the Commonwealth, delivers a judgement on this subject similar to that already delivered by the *Canons of Dort*. Previous to Adam's fall, so it declares, human nature enjoyed unfettered choice. But 'man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation; so as a natural man, being altogether averse from that good, and dead in sin, is not able by his own strength to convert himself, or to prepare himself thereunto.'[3] Thus 'we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good,

[1] *Theologia Christiana*, iv. 12, § 8.

[2] *Ibid.*, 14. § 21: '... nisi enim a praeveniente gratia liberum arbitrium excitatum esset, gratiae co-operari non posset.' Cp. the *Conf. of the Remonstrants*, xvii. 5 and 7.

[3] vi. 3.

and wholly inclined to all evil.'[1] But 'when God converts a sinner, and translates him into the state of grace, He freeth him from his natural bondage under sin, and by His grace alone enables him freely to will and to do that which is spiritually good; yet so as that, by reason of his remaining corruption, he doth not perfectly nor only will that which is good, but doth also will that which is evil.'[2] 'Sin and corruption,' remarks Bunyan, 'would as naturally bubble out of my heart as water would bubble out of a fountain,'[3] and Bunyan's works make it clear how he regarded such a state as belonging to the unregenerate nature of man. But, to change the figure to Owen's, 'under the ashes of our collapsed nature there are yet remaining certain sparks of celestial fire'—sparks which the Holy Spirit alone can fan into a flame; for it is He who is 'the immediate efficient cause of all grace and gracious effects in men,' 'whenever He wins their full response.[5] Howbeit, proceeds Owen, there is darkness in the heart until the Holy Spirit lighten it.[6] The unregenerate are unable of themselves to exercise saving faith apart from the prevenient influence of the Spirit (Eph. iv. 17 f.).[7] Apart from this the mind, of itself, has no power whatsoever toward salvation. 'The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God' (1 Cor. ii. 14),[8] for his mind simply cannot accept them.[9] At the most, he has a 'passive power' to obey God, but this can never be effectual apart from the Holy Spirit.[10] For saving faith is more than the exercise of natural faculties in the fulfilling of natural duties: it is supernatural faith and Divine love appropriated and used as an act of the whole soul.[11] 'Without an infused habit of internal inherent grace, received from Christ by an efficacious work of the Spirit, no man can believe or obey God. . . . And if we abide not in this principle, we let in the whole poisonous flood of Pelagianism into the Church.' To say otherwise 'is to overthrow the Gospel and the faith of the Catholic Church in all ages.'[12] Regeneration, or that conviction of sin at its beginning, is very much more

[1] *Westminster Confession*, vi. 23. [2] ix. 4. [3] *Grace Abounding*.
[4] *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, p. 228. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 232.
[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 281 ff. [7] *Ibid.*, p. 287. [8] *Ibid.*, p. 296.
[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 308 ff. 'There is in us that which may be quickened and saved. And this is all we have to boast of by nature.'—*Ibid.*, p. 343. Cp. Bishop Thomas Sherlock's *Discourse* on Eph. ii. 8 (*Discourses*, ed. 1754–8, no. iii).
[10] *Ibid.*, pp. 335 f. [11] *Ibid.*, p. 303. [12] *Ibid.*, pp. 339 f.

than moral suasion, as Pelagianism teaches.[1] Conversion is by no means simply a human act; it is also an act of God's grace, whereby the very power to exercise our own will is granted to us.[2] Moreover, the regenerated life which follows conversion is really an actual infusion of the life of God by His Spirit.[3] No less should we guard against Semi-Pelagianism, which also regards conversion essentially as moral persuasion, and nothing more—merely the act of the illumined mind, with no 'regeneration' whatever being involved.[4] Surely it is absurd to pray for that which is within our own power.[5] In point of fact, however, our regeneration is far from being within our own power. We are dependent entirely on the new birth from above, and in this there is both a moral and a physical operation of the Holy Spirit on mind and soul (Eph. i. 19, 20). This influence is irresistible. The human will naturally reacts, but it is against the external expressions of the Spirit's internal working that it reacts, rather than against that internal working itself. It is, then, this internal work of God which gradually influences the will unto Himself, until actual conversion takes place.[6] Hence, we conclude that, in our conversion, what God does is even more than give us power to believe: He works actual faith in us, and that irresistibly (Phil. i. 6),[7] renewing our minds by His Spirit (Tit. iii. 5),[8] and ensuring for us, whom He has justified, the continuance of His sanctifying work. This indication of Owen's Calvinistic outlook did not escape the critical eye of Clagett. In his *Discourse concerning the Operations of the Holy Spirit* Clagett observes that faith is the first grace of the Holy Spirit, 'because a hearty belief of the Gospel is the foundation of all other Christian virtues. . . . And the teachableness of mind, which is necessary to actual believing, is from the Holy Spirit. And I only say that faith in this sense is an effect of His operations upon the minds of men.' The Spirit neither reveals nor convinces by immediate inspiration, but He gradually opens men's hearts to receive the Word, promoting holy desires within them at the beginning of their renewal, and afterward helping forward their growth

1 *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, pp. 351 f.
2 *Ibid.*, p. 359.
3 *Ibid.*, pp. 357 ff.
4 *Ibid.*, p. 362.
5 *Ibid.*, p. 363.
6 *Ibid.*, pp. 368 ff.
7 *Ibid.*, p. 377.
8 *Ibid.*, p. 387.

in the sanctified life.[1] If, as Owen evidently intended to convey, conversion is brought about solely by an irresistible, physical operation of the Holy Spirit, Clagett cannot agree with him. In his view, conversion is rather the result of two factors—the appeal of the Word of God, and the influence of the Spirit of God, both of which can undoubtedly be resisted.[2] In our growth in grace, too, our will must operate in response to the Divine will.[3] But here, again, Owen upholds (1) a progress in holiness on the part of the regenerate which is caused by an immediate and irresistible operation of the Spirit, and (2) a diligent use of the means of grace as an aid to it. Clagett at once rejoins that the first is wrong, and, if it be right, the second is unnecessary.[4] No, he says; sanctification, from the human standpoint, is not so passive a thing. It must issue from man's own determination, side by side with the help of the Holy Spirit. 'The reason,' he adds, 'why any command of God seems difficult, and is at any time displeasing to us, is because we do not obey it enough.'[5] Owen's insistence on the pre-eminence of grace, as both initiating and sustaining saving faith in the individual soul, was in full accord with the general belief of the Church. It was when he declared this pre-eminence to imply irresistibility, in bringing about not merely consideration of salvation but actual acceptance of it, that he laid himself open to the criticism of his contemporary.

II

To the Deistic philosophers, the natural man is in no sense 'fallen,' neither is his will of itself spiritually ineffective. Reason is his sufficient guide in belief, morality his sufficient guide in practice. He has therefore no need whatever of salvation in the Christian sense, or of the influence of a Divine Spirit. Such a theory, in Butler's opinion, is inconsistent with actual life as he finds it. 'We are,' he writes, 'an inferior part of the creation of God. There are natural appearances of our being in a state of degradation. And we certainly are in a condition which does not seem, by any means, the most advantageous we could imagine or desire, either in our natural

[1] *Discourse*, pt. i. iv. 1. [2] *Ibid.*, vii. 1. [3] *Ibid.*, 3. [4] Pt. ii. vii. 3. [5] *Ibid.*, 4.

or moral capacity, for securing either our present or future interest.'[1] This may be rectified by the means placed at our disposal, such as self-discipline and the sustained exercise of virtue; yet not by these only: especially must we obey the commands of God, which are framed for our own good.[2] But when the inquiry is extended into the wide domain of moral philosophy, varied answers are obtained to questions of the nature and functions of the human will. Descartes, regarding it as the 'central energy of thought,' gives importance to it as the arbiter between good and evil. Knowledge imparts true freedom to the will, and more freedom as the will is more and more exercised.[3] On the other hand, Spinoza, as might be expected from his pantheistic system, denies any such freedom to the will on the ground that good and evil are only relative, for the simple reason that nothing 'finite' is independent. 'The human mind is part of the infinite intelligence of God. . . . Accordingly, in the human mind there is no absolute or free will.'[4] Will indeed exists in the Divine Being, where it is 'free' simply to arise out of the necessity of the Divine Nature; but it exists in no other, since every other is but a mode of the Divine. This is the view at which we arrive *sub specie aeternitatis*, when we are directed not by self-interest but by reason. From this position the step to the denial of the reality of sin is easily taken. Of the problem of the existence of evil, Froude remarks, in his *Essay on Spinoza*, 'that of all theories about it Spinoza's would appear to us the least irrational, if our conscience did not forbid us to listen to it.' Froude feels that such a problem is primarily one affecting practical life. In practice, we are not *absolutely* free, for many influences are shed on our life from without; yet, he adds, our very sense of duty shows that 'there is somewhere a point of freedom' which is essential to true spiritual experience. It is difficult to see how Spinoza could reconcile his allusion to evil as that which obstructs in the attainment of good, with his conviction that nothing takes place which is against the will of God. Some element of freedom is at least suggested by self-development, or self-realization, which is held to be necessary in order that 'salvation' may be reached.

[1] *Analogy*, i. 4.
[2] *Ibid.*, 5.
[3] See *Encycl. Brit.*, arts. 'Descartes,' 'Cartesianism.'
[4] *Ethics*, ii.

With Leibnitz also, there is denial of freedom to the will, at any rate in effect, such being implied throughout his whole system of monads in a prearranged order.[1] Wolff, following his lead, adopts likewise a deterministic attitude, venturing at the same time to anticipate a state of human perfection. Certain philosophers thus point to individual impotence in the natural order as following on determinism, even as certain theologians point to it in the spiritual order as following on moral collapse. Kant and Fichte, on the other hand, unite in contending for the freedom of the will. In his *Critique of Practical Reason* (1788) Kant argues that subjective experience must be based on self-consciousness, itself free, inherent in the will, and possessing moral choice. This is the ground of the moral law rather than the external existence of the Supreme Good, though it is naturally conditioned by it. The definition of freedom which he presents, however, exalts the will to the exclusion of the deeper self, and therefore, in Dr. Pope's words, 'omits what is essential, . . . that the laws of freedom are under the government of the Holy Spirit.'[2] In Fichte's system the personal 'subjective' is intensified, and the general question of the relationship of the Divine and the human is treated with a religious tendency which is not conspicuous in Kant. Neither is it conspicuous in contemporary British philosophy. Something of the materialism and determinism of Hobbes appears especially in his *Questions concerning Liberty, Necessity, and Chance,* which he published in 1656. Each act of volition, he asserts, is influenced by previous acts; thus, according to Erdmann, 'only in doing what is willed is one free, but one does not will to will.'[3] Similarly Hume declares that the acts of volition cannot be independent of character, and character is just the sum of what has preceded in the will. In the teaching of Locke, as Dr. Fisher reminds us, freedom may relate to the effects of volition, but not to the act of volition itself. But Locke's Arminian friends succeeded in so modifying this position that, in the form in which it came to influence the 'New-England' theology, freedom was regarded as residing in the very act of volition, the will being,

[1] It was against the pantheism of Spinoza and the determinism of Leibnitz that Samuel Clarke championed the freedom of the will.

[2] *Compendium of Christian Theology*, iii. p. 164.

[3] Erdmann, *History of Philosophy*, i. p. 715. Also see *Encycl. Brit.*, art. 'Ethics.'

in practice if not quite in theory, dependent on the stimulus of the Holy Spirit for good actions, and on His renewing for progress in the spiritual life. While, then, Edwards, with his Calvinistic outlook, refuses to allow an 'arbitrary' freedom to the will, considering that freedom relates to the whole past experience of volition, he upholds a natural ability towards the good, which, nevertheless, *will not* be exercised apart from the Holy Spirit.[1]

The various movements here grouped under the head of Mysticism speak with differing voices on the present subject. Jansenism denied the doctrine of free-will as taught by the Roman Catholic Church, affirming that Divine grace works in the soul irresistibly. Jansen was convinced that Roman teaching had not followed the doctrine of the Early Church concerning the will. In his *Augustinus* he endeavours to prove that, since the Fall, the human race has not been in possession of freedom of will, and therefore there is, even in the best of men, a natural inability to perform all the Divine commands. Both Pascal and Arnauld refused to believe that Jansenism was Calvinistic. However, the *Augustinus* reveals anti-Pelagianism to an extreme, and this revival of Augustinianism cannot be accepted as in full accord with Roman theology, at least with that as expounded by the Sorbonne. The passivity encouraged also by Quietism tended to belittle the natural functions of the will, and to overlook the fact that the influence of the Spirit of God within the soul is strongest when the will that it should work therein is strongest. Contemplation as advocated by Molinos meant the complete repression of the will. With the Quakers the situation was altogether different. Barclay states that, owing to the Fall, there exists in man a sinful inclination, but that in this there is no guilt until by actual sin man joins himself to it. The notion of 'original sin,' by which sin has been imputed to infants, is, he protests, an 'unscriptural barbarism.'[2] Moreover, in spite of the Fall, 'there is an evangelical and saving light and grace in all,'[3] which is bestowed and sustained by the Holy Spirit. Such inner light is no light of nature. 'We

[1] See Fisher, *History of Christian Doctrine*, p. 402; also James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, pp. 228 ff.

[2] *An Apology for the True Christian Divinity*, prop. 4.

[3] *Ibid.*, prop. 6. See also prop. 5.

renounce all natural power and ability in ourselves, in order to bring us out of our lost and fallen condition and first nature ; and confess that, as of ourselves we are able to do nothing that is good, so neither can we procure remission of sins or justification by any act of our own.' The works of the justified are 'the works of the Spirit of grace in the heart, wrought in conformity to the inward and spiritual law ; which works are not wrought on man's will, nor by his power and ability, but in and by the power and Spirit of Christ in us.' [1] Since, therefore, the doctrine whereby some are 'predestinated to eternal damnation' is both 'horrible and blasphemous,' all men without exception are offered salvation, either to accept or to reject, and it is within their power to do either freely. 'As the grace and light in all is sufficient to save all, and of its own nature would save all, so it strives and wrestles with all, in order to save them. He that resists its striving is the cause of his own condemnation ; he that resists it not, it becomes his salvation. So that in him that is saved, the working is of the *grace*, and not of the *man*.' [2]

Swedenborg allows more liberty to the human will than even Barclay. Not that man is independent of God in the act of willing, but God allows him freedom to will within certain Divinely appointed limits. The belief that man's nature and will became perverted in his Fall makes no difference : he still assists in the renovation of himself as he wills to receive life from Christ. Further, this liberty granted to the human will is, in Swedenborg's opinion, extended to the state after death, in which the spirits are free to do what they please, and to go wherever they desire. Perhaps William Law also gives more scope to the will than Barclay does, though, as would be expected, he keeps more to the beaten track than Swedenborg. Insistent as Law is on the necessity of the Spirit's work, he attaches great importance to human powers of determination, believing that moral and spiritual failures result not so much from want of power as from want of intention. 'If,' he writes, 'you will here stop and ask yourself why you are not as pious as the primitive Christians were, your own heart will tell you that it is neither through ignorance nor inability, but purely because you never thoroughly intended it.' The method

[1] *Apology*, prop. 7. [2] *Ibid.*, prop. 6.

of 'stopping and asking oneself,' which Law so frequently recommends, no doubt has a salutary effect on the mind. 'If you would but use yourself to such meditations as these,' he remarks, 'to reflect upon the vanity of all orders of life without piety, to consider how all the ways of the world are so many different ways of error, blindness, or mistake; you would soon find your heart made wiser and better by it.' 'Think, and then determine,' is the essence of this advice: but, adds Law, 'this doctrine does not suppose that we have no need of Divine grace, or that it is in our own power to make ourselves perfect.'[1]

'Wesleyanism,' writes Dr. Orr, 'is sometimes classed with Arminianism, but it essentially differs from it in the central place it gives to the work of the Spirit of God in regeneration.'[2] As Dr. Fisher notes, so central a place was not given by the early Arminians on the Continent on account of their Pelagian inclinations,[3] nor by the later Arminians in England who retained some of their freethinking tendencies.[4] The Arminianism as expounded by Wesley and that as expounded by certain of the more immediate followers of Arminius were very distantly related. Indeed, 'Methodist theology is Arminian as opposed to Calvinism, but in no other sense.'[5] Accordingly the anti-Methodist fulminations of Toplady († 1778) in his *Church of England Vindicated from the Charge of Arminianism* (1774) were somewhat wide of the mark.

Wesley's doctrine of the will follows the tenth Article of the Church of England. 'The Methodists believe . . . that man is very far gone from original righteousness, and of his own nature inclined to evil, and that continually; . . . not subject to the law of God, nor capable of being so, till regenerated by grace.'[6] Apart from the assistance of the Holy Spirit the will is powerless in the direction of the good.[7] Howbeit, the 'merits' of Christ's death, along with the universal operation of His

1 *Serious Call*, chap. ii. 2 James Orr, *The Progress of Dogma*, p. 300.
3 *History of Christian Doctrine*, p. 392.
4 Dr. Daniel Whitby, an Arminian who turned Arian, is a case in point.
5 W. B. Pope, *Compendium*, i. p. 20.
6 Crowther, *History of the Wesleyan Methodists*, p. 180.
7 'The faculty of willing is untouched in any case, and the influence of conscience prompts it to will the right; but this is bound up with a miserable impotence to good, and results in both a natural and a moral inability to do what the law of God requires.' —W. B. Pope, *ibid.*, ii. p. 67.

Spirit, enable man to strengthen his will supernaturally and so to accept the offer of salvation.[1] It is this 'preventing grace,' by which is meant 'all the convictions which His Spirit from time to time works in every child of man,'[2] that restores the 'balance' to his power of choice. 'There is no man,' Wesley observes, 'that is in a state of mere nature. . . . What is vulgarly called "natural conscience" . . . is more properly termed preventing grace,' by which freedom of will is restored to all.[3] That saving faith which alone can give full opportunity to the Holy Spirit must be the outcome of a will essentially free, whose action is not overshadowed by the least Divine compulsion, yet whose 'co-operation with grace is of grace.' No account, therefore, need be taken, in this connexion, of any 'infinite series of previous volitions,'[4] for a 'saving' act of the will, thus supernaturally assisted, has a force which makes it, in practice, independent of its unhelpful antecedents. This is so even if the soul possesses but a small measure of 'preventing grace.' 'No man sins because he has not grace, but because he does not use the grace which he hath.'[5] Sinful antecedents may induce the will to take a certain course of sinful action, and to stifle good desires 'before they can strike deep root,'[6] but they cannot affect those powers of volition which prevenient grace has restored,[7] still less the Christian conscience which is the possession of the believer.[8] Should the will, thus 'freed,' exercise saving faith, justification immediately ensues, and the new life in the Spirit has begun; but this again is just as dependent on the continued response of the will to the sanctifying work of the same Spirit.[9] No lawful insistence on the co-operation of the will can, however, obscure the fact that the Holy Spirit is the predominant Partner in such co-operation, for, as Wesley concludes, 'it is certain all true faith, and the

1 'Whatever power there is in the human will—in its ability as well as in its choice—comes from the redemption of Christ.'—Pope, *Compendium*, p. 80.

2 Wesley's *Sermon* on 'The Scripture Way of Salvation.'

3 *Sermon* on 'Working out our own Salvation.'

4 Cp. the views of Jonathan Edwards.

5 *Sermon* on 'Working out our own Salvation.'

6 Cp. James Denney, *Studies in Theology*, p. 81.

7 It was Wesley's appeal to the responsibility of the whole man that helped to make his preaching so penetrating.

8 I understand it is impossible to make anyone go directly against the habits of conscience even when under hypnotic suggestion.

9 Wesley constantly warned his hearers against 'falling from grace.'

whole work of salvation, every good thought, word, and work, is altogether by the operation of the Spirit of God.' [1]

In the opinion of the late William James, ' Protestantism has been too pessimistic as regards the natural man.' [2] Admittedly this appears to be true of certain kinds of Protestantism, but it is by no means true of all. The general attitude of Protestant Christendom to the whole subject may fairly be expressed by these striking words of Professor Rudolf Otto : ' The recipient of Divine grace feels and knows ever more and more surely, as he looks back on his past, that he has not grown into his present self through any achievement or effort of his own, and that, apart from his own will or power, grace was imparted to him, grasped him, impelled, and led him. And even the resolves and decisions that were most his own and most free become to him, without losing the element of freedom, something that he *experienced* rather than *did*.' [3]

[1] *A Farther Appeal*, pt. i. i. 6. [2] *Varieties of Religious Experience*, p. 114.

[3] *The Idea of the Holy*, p. 91. In the confessions of Tokichi Ishii, a condemned murderer, written in Tokyo Prison, 1918, and published under the title of *A Gentleman in Prison*, occur these words (p. 80) : ' By the power of that one word of Christ's, " Father forgive them, for they know not what they do," my unspeakably hardened heart was changed, and I repented of all my crimes. *Such power is not in man.* [Italics mine.]

XIV

THE WORK OF THE SPIRIT IN JUSTIFICATION

'What will it profit you to save three Kingdoms by your sorrows, and in the meantime to carry in your own bosoms dying, perishing souls, of which every single one is more worth than all the world?'

PETER STERRY

(*Sermon before the House of Commons*, 1645)

XIV

THE WORK OF THE SPIRIT IN JUSTIFICATION

I

Roman Catholic theology, as systematized by the Council of Trent, declares that salvation is based not on faith alone in Christ as Saviour, but on faith which is itself a work prompted by love. In response to faith righteousness is infused into the soul by the Spirit of God, and, at the same time, power is given whereby eternal life may be attained through the merit of good works. The Greek Church does not clearly define justification in her older confessions, not even in the *Orthodox Confession* of 1643, though the *Confession of Dositheus* is more explicit ;[1] but her doctrine is manifestly closely akin to the Roman, namely, that justification is the Divine act by which man is *made* righteous, the operative principle of sin being removed. Works are united with faith as the condition of salvation, sanctification following simply as a perfecting process. In its later development, Arminianism laid similar stress on good works, while denying their 'merit.' The *Remonstrance* is entirely free from any such emphasis, its first Article affirming that those are saved who 'by the grace of the Holy Spirit' believe in the Son of God, and 'by the same grace persevere to the end in that faith and the obedience of that faith.' The *Confession of the Remonstrants* (ch. xi) adopts the same view. But, to Limborch, faith includes works, and is not a justifying faith unless it does.[2] It is true that he regards the assistance of the Holy Spirit as essential, nevertheless he attributes the works to the believer rather than to his faith as

[1] πιστεύομεν οὐ διὰ πίστεως ἁπλῶς μόνης δικαιοῦσθαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ διὰ πίστεως ἐνεργουμένης διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης, τ' αὐτον εἰπεῖν, διὰ τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῶν ἔργων.

[2] *Theologia Christiana*, vi. 4, § 22: 'Sciendum, quando dicimus, nos fide justificari, nos non excludere opera, quae fides exigit et tanquam foecunda mater producit; sed ea includere. . . Sine operibus autem fides mortua et ad justificationem inefficax est.'

the gift of God.[1] Luther, on the other hand, had proclaimed justification to be by faith alone (*per solam fidem*), and in so doing had meant a faith which was a personal venture of the whole man on the redeeming Christ, and which, accordingly, was nearly equivalent to what most of the Schoolmen had meant by love.[2] To Luther's preaching of this doctrine may be traced much of the modern regard paid to the Divine work in the soul and the value of a living experience of grace, both arising out of such a new and transforming relationship. At the beginning of this new relationship, therefore, justification stands as an act of Divine pardon in which the righteousness of God is not infused, but imputed, the process of sanctification following the imputation. This, which had been the belief of the Reformers generally, now found expression in the *Westminster Confession*: 'Those whom God effectually calleth He also freely justifieth, not by infusing righteousness into them, but by pardoning their sins, and by accounting and accepting their persons as righteous: not for anything wrought in them, or done by them, but for Christ's sake alone: not by imputing faith itself, the act of believing, or any other evangelical obedience, to them as their righteousness; but by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them, they receiving and resting on Him and His righteousness by faith: which faith they have not of themselves; it is the gift of God.'[3] 'Faith, thus receiving and resting on Christ and His righteousness, is the alone instrument of justification; yet is it not alone in the person justified, but is ever accompanied with all other saving graces, and is no dead faith, but worketh by love.'[4] The *Confession* makes it clear, however, that only those who are elected unto glory 'are effectually called unto faith in Christ by His Spirit working in due season. . . . Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only.'[5] It was given to one of the members of the Assembly to clothe with singularly

[1] *Theologia Christiana*, vi. 4, § 31: 'Fides est conditio in nobis et a nobis requisita, ut justificationem consequamur. Est itaque actus, qui licet in se spectatus perfectus nequaquam sit, sed in multis deficiens, tamen a Deo gratiosa et liberrima voluntate pro pleno et perfecto acceptatur et *propter quem* Deus homini gratiose remissionem peccatorum et vivae aeternae praemium conferre vult.' See also § 46.

[2] Harnack notes the practical side of Luther's faith (*Hist. of Dogma*, vii. § 4) and William James its spiritual depth (*V.R.E.*, p. 246).

[3] xi. § 1. [4] *Ibid.*, § 2. [5] iii. § 6: also x. § 4.

choice language the experience of justification in a way in which their corporate *Confession* could never have done. Thus Sterry says : ' As the looking forth of the sun melts the snow, so do the shinings out of Jesus Christ melt the soul. 'Tis sweet when a saint says, " Mine eyes have seen my Saviour, and now they pour forth tears." A rainbow, the covenant of peace, is then formed, when the sun shines upon a watery cloud. When Christ puts forth Himself, and scatters His beams upon a mourning cloudy soul, then follows fair weather ; there is peace. This is a spiritual conviction, a conviction by the beams of beauty.' [1]

In face of Socinianism, which accompanied later Arminianism in uniting faith and works as the condition of salvation, English theology continued to teach the Reformed doctrine of salvation by faith alone, wrought in the heart by the Holy Spirit on the basis of the atoning merits of Christ. The Holy Spirit, says Barrow, is ' the Enlivener of our dead souls, . . . the Imparter of spiritual strength, . . . that enableth us to perform the duties and accomplish the conditions required of us, in order to our salvation ; that qualifieth us to be the sons of God by His effectual grace.' [2] In his *Defence of the Doctrine of Justification by Faith in Jesus Christ*,[3] Barrow's better-known contemporary, John Bunyan, follows the same course. Three things, he declares, are essential to holiness : (1) the Holy Ghost, (2) faith in Christ, and (3) a new heart. ' Wherein,' he asks,[4] ' doth the saving grace of the Spirit appear ? In taking possession of us for His own, in His making of us His house and habitation . . . He saveth us from our darkness by illuminating of us. He it is that convinceth us of the evil of our unbelief. . . . This is He that worketh faith in our hearts. . . . This is He by whom we are born again. . . . By this Spirit we come to see the beauty of Christ. . . . By this blessed Spirit the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts, and our hearts are directed into the love of God '—a striking description of the beginning of the new friendship. One cannot but notice how both these Puritans, Sterry and Bunyan, refer

1 *Sermon* on ' The Spirit's Conviction of Sin.'

2 *A Defence of the Blessed Trinity.*

3 Written against Edward Fowler, afterwards Bishop of Gloucester, who displayed tendencies towards ' Pelagianism.'

4 This in *Saved by Grace.*

to the appeal of Christ's beauty. Owen's noted work, *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, constantly insists on the close relationship between salvation and the work of the Holy Spirit. Regeneration is assigned to Him throughout the New Testament, where it is seen to be much more than 'a metaphorical expression of amendment of life.'[1] No sense of shame alone is enough 'to guide us to the blood of Christ'; only the conviction of the Spirit,[2] who works in us saving faith.[3] 'The work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration doth not consist in enthusiastical raptures:'[4] it proceeds ineffably on the basis of Scripture, and through natural faculties,[5] its preparatory effects before regeneration being illumination, conviction, and reformation.[6] 'If,' so Owen concludes, 'there be no such work of the Holy Spirit upon the hearts of men, and that indispensably necessary to their salvation, . . . their deceived hearts have fed upon ashes, and they are yet in their sins.'[7] Such definiteness makes it all the more surprising that Clagett could imagine Owen's view of regeneration to be simply the *addition* of something new to the previous experience, instead of, what he himself holds, a new experience altogether.[8] For him to imply that Owen thinks it possible to 'believe the Gospel and keep the commandments of God, without the renewing grace of the Holy Spirit,'[9] is grossly to misinterpret the great book he is venturing to criticize. While feeling the effects of the operations of the Spirit, so Clagett proceeds, we do not understand those operations themselves.[10] We know, however, that there is a preventing, or common grace of the Spirit, and there is a subsequent, or special grace of the Spirit; and that the latter is given to all who have not refused the former.[11] All, that is, who 'are persuaded that Jesus is the Christ' receive this regenerating grace; not only those who are elected by God, as Owen is held to affirm.[12] The conception of sanctification as a progressive work, a growth in grace, and therefore distinct from regeneration, does not commend itself to Clagett. He feels that there is properly no such distinction. Owen, in his opinion, stands too much upon the metaphor of regeneration

[1] p. 240. [2] p. 524. [3] p. 525. [4] p. 256.
[5] p. 258. [6] pp. 281 f. [7] p. 38.
[8] *A Discourse concerning the Operations of the Holy Spirit*, pt. i. iii. § 2.
[9] *Ibid.*, § 7. [10] *Ibid.*, § 10. [11] *Ibid.*, vi. § 1. [12] *Ibid.*, § 2.

as an instantaneous act. 'The state of a regenerate man, as such, is capable of degrees; and, although the term "regeneration," and that also of "conversion," imply that his state is changed from what it once was, yet they are used to express his continuance in that state, as well as the beginning of it.' If there are degrees in unregeneracy (Matt. xxiii. 15), why not in regeneracy? Such endeavours to make a difference between regeneration and sanctification is, asserts Clagett, 'an unprofitable nicety.'[1] The references to this subject which are found in the works of Bull and Matthew Henry are of the familiar type, Bull doing little more in his *Harmonia Apostolica* than express belief in the doctrine of justification by faith (xi.), Henry, in his *Exposition of the New Testament* (on John iii. 6–8), remarking that 'the Spirit, in regeneration, works arbitrarily, as a free Agent; . . . powerfully, and with evident effects, . . . mysteriously, and in secret, hidden ways.'

In his *History of the Corruptions of Christianity*, Priestley speaks of the death of Christ as meant, not to atone for sin, but 'to teach the doctrine of a resurrection to a future immortal life,'[2] and thereby 'to give the fullest proof of a future life of retribution, in order to supply the strongest motives to virtue.'[3] The death of Christ was also 'a most perfect example of voluntary obedience to the will of God,'[4] and nothing more, even though 1 John iii. 16 ('He laid down His life for us') is quoted in support. The Lord's agony in Gethsemane, of course, had no reference to the cost of His redemption of humanity. 'Our Saviour, as an innocent man, could have no terrors of a guilty conscience, and therefore,' Priestley concludes, 'He could feel nothing but the dread of His approaching painful and ignominious death.' Both Old and New Testaments show that God is merciful to the penitent, but how He deals with the guilt incurred by past sin is not made clear. Divine atonement is accordingly ruled out. 'In England,' says Priestley, 'this doctrine of atonement seems to have got as firm possession of the minds of men as that of the Divinity of Christ.' But 'that a Socinian should hold this doctrine, in any sense, is hardly possible.'[5] It is therefore little to be

[1] *Discourse*, pt. ii. vii. § 1.
[2] i. pp. 173 ff.
[3] p. 177. How could this doctrine be enforced by his quoting Rev. . 5 ('Unto Him that loveth us, and loosed us from our sins in His own blood.')?
[4] pp. 180 f.
[5] pp. 274 .

wondered at that Unitarianism had no place for the work of the Holy Spirit in redemption, nor, in consequence, for any movement which might be called a Revival of religion. Unitarianism, observes Horsley, ' is not well calculated ' to convert the world.[1]

II

From what has been said in previous chapters concerning the outlook of philosophy, little may be expected from that quarter relevant to this doctrine. Spinoza, for instance, asserts that there is no such thing as individual responsibility for what is generally called evil. The way of salvation is, he holds, through knowledge, particularly that adequate kind of knowledge which knows the results of actions, and which has as its ultimate the knowledge of God. He grants, at least, that ' the better a thing or a person be, the more there is in him of God's Spirit.' But Rationalism, as Otto has said, ' lacked understanding of what " sin " is,'[2] that is, of that ' sense of sin ' which ' does not spring from the consciousness of some committed transgression, but rather is an immediate datum given with the feeling of the numen.'[3] On the other hand, Francis Bacon, in his *Confession of Faith* years before, had professed a very real connexion between sin, as a positive fact in individual life, and the Holy Spirit, as the One who alone can cleanse from it and empower against it. ' I believe,' he wrote, ' that the sufferings and merits of Christ, as they are sufficient to do away the sins of the whole world, so they are only effectual to those that are regenerate by the Holy Ghost, who breatheth where He will of free grace, which grace . . . quickeneth the spirit of man, and conceiveth him anew the son of God and the member of Christ ; . . . which seed of the Holy Ghost first figureth in us the image of Christ slain or crucified, in a lively faith, and then reneweth in us the image of God in holiness and charity.' ' If,' now adds Butler, ' mankind are corrupted and depraved in their moral character,

[1] *Sixteenth Letter* (*Tracts*, pp. 298 ff.).

[2] *Idea of the Holy*, p. 55.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 52 f. Cp. William James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, p. 455 : ' The attempt to demonstrate by purely intellectual processes the truth of the deliverances of direct religious experience is absolutely hopeless.'

and so are unfit for that state which Christ is gone to prepare for His disciples; and if the assistance of God's Spirit be necessary to renew their nature, in the degree requisite to their being qualified for that state (John iii. 5), . . . is it possible any serious person can think it a slight matter whether or no he makes use of the means, expressly commanded by God, for obtaining this Divine assistance?'[1] Campbell spoke in like manner, remarking that 'it is with the good things of the Spirit, as with what are called the good things of life, the most necessary are the most common, and the most easily acquired.'[2]

The movements here considered under the head of Mysticism afford varying interpretations of justification. Quietism encouraged passivity to the extent almost of a fanatical decrial of good works. To the majority of Mystics, however, justification was essentially ethical in content, and accordingly dependent on more than faith alone. Thus, while Quakerism holds to Christ's atonement in the external, objective sense, as giving the *capacity* for salvation; it regards justification as an ethical principle, as the growth of Christ in the heart by means of the inner light. So the works of Christ are performed by the justified person, which works are themselves essential to his justified state. 'We cannot,' urges Barclay, 'exclude works from justification. For, though properly we be not justified *for* them, yet are we justified *in* them; and they are necessary, even as *causa sine qua non*. . . . Since good works as naturally follow from this birth as heat from fire, therefore are they of absolute necessity to justification as *causa sine qua non, i.e.* though not as the cause for which, yet as that *in which* we are, and without which we cannot be justified; and though they be not meritorious, and draw no debt upon God, yet He cannot but accept and reward them.'[3] No clear distinction is here drawn between justification and sanctification, the whole emphasis in the Atonement being laid on union with Christ—much as if St. Paul had begun his *Epistle to the Romans* at the sixth chapter. Nevertheless, these words of Barclay's, early in his *Apology*, are rightly insistent on the necessity for a

[1] *Analogy*, ii. 1.
[2] *A New Translation of the Four Gospels*, vol. i. p. 81.
[3] *Apology*, prop. 7

saving knowledge of Christ: 'That which is spiritual can only be known and discerned by the Spirit of God. But the revelation of Jesus Christ, and the true and saving knowledge of Him, is spiritual. Therefore the revelation of Jesus Christ, and the true and saving knowledge of Him, can only be known and discerned by the Spirit of God. . . . The knowledge, then, of Christ which is not by the revelation of His own Spirit in the heart is no more properly the knowledge of Christ than the prattling of a parrot, which has been taught a few words.'[1] Similarly, Swedenborg refuses to consent to justification by faith alone, the essence of religion, in his opinion, being the doing of good and the striving after the highest usefulness. Salvation, in this sense, would appear to denote simply the attainment of a certain ethical standard, together with a supreme love for God; God's part therein having been taken when He assumed our humanity, thereby purifying and glorifying it, in order that He might be able to influence it more directly.[2] Any account of past sins against God, or outrages against His moral order, require no atonement such as that which is generally accepted by the Christian Church, there being 'no such thing as Divine wrath,' for 'God is Love itself.'[3] Little place for Divine forgiveness is found in the Swedenborgian system, evidently because there is no great need for it. The relationship which is discernible between the doctrine of salvation by faith as preached by the Reformers, and the doctrine of salvation by love which had been taught by the Mystics, enables Otto to refer to Boehme as 'an heir of Luther.'[4] Indeed, faith had virtually the same significance for them both. Certainly it is not the mere acceptance of external facts, Boehme declares, for even the devils accept external facts. True faith means fellowship with Christ[5]—a fellowship in which we are regenerated by the power of the Holy

1 *Apology*, prop. 2.

2 Swedenborg holds that the oneness of the Divine *Personality* is essential to Divine righteousness in the work of redemption, since God 'bears' all Himself. But no less is this true of the 'Tri-personal' Deity, in whom Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are essentially One.

3 H. G. Drummond, *New Church Manual*, p. 21. The Biblical references to the Divine anger are, he adds, 'only used to express the way in which the Divine Love and Wisdom appear to evil men.'

4 *Idea of the Holy*, pp. 107 f., 112.

5 See Erdmann, *Hist. of Phil.*, i. p. 592. Also cp. Wesley's *Sermon* on 'Salvation by Faith.'

Spirit.[1] In order to guard against religious formalism, such as obtained in the Lutheran Church of his day, Spener laid special stress on works as the necessary evidence of faith. This attitude was developed by the later Pietists, who, with the highest motives, proclaimed salvation to be by works as well as by faith. The Moravian Church, springing into life largely through the Pietist movement, went back to Spener's position, namely, that of saving faith in Christ as the one first essential to justification on the human side, the works of His indwelling Spirit being simply its necessary evidence. The influence of this teaching, brought to bear particularly through Peter Böhler, prompted Wesley to abandon that on which he had relied—his own ' work of righteousness ' ; and it was only when later Moravian teachers began to depreciate even the *evidential* value of such work, in face of their own doctrinal standards, that he parted company with them.

Guided by Böhler, Wesley came to abandon his notion of faith as equivalent to correct opinions,[2] and after his evangelical conversion he constantly endeavoured to remove that misconception from the minds of others, preaching everywhere the doctrine of ' salvation by grace, through faith, not of ourselves,' and emphasizing faith as not ' a train of ideas in the head,' but ' a disposition of the heart.' [3] ' Justifying faith implies,' he affirms, ' not only a Divine evidence or conviction that " God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself," but a sure trust and confidence that Christ died for *my* sins, that He loved *me*, and gave Himself for *me*. And at what time soever a sinner thus believes, be it in early childhood, in the

Three Principles of the Divine Essence, § 9. Cp. also his *Threefold Life of Man*, and his *Incarnation*. William Law was another who spoke of the Atonement as based not on Divine wrath but on Divine love, thus revolting against the forensic theory (Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, p. 281). But he did not deny the possibility of Divine wrath itself. [See Mark iii. 5 ; Heb. xii. 29 ; Rev. vi. 16.]

2 J. H. Rigg, *The Living Wesley*, pp. 112 ff. Further, sacramental ' theories ' of salvation had not sufficed, either for Wesley or for England ; and, in view of the history of the Evangelical Revival, such a declaration as is made by Bp. Gore (*The Holy Spirit and the Church*, p. 283), to the effect that the Sacraments are *the* ' divinely given occasions and instruments for the bestowal of . . regeneration, and the possession of the Spirit,' can hardly be true to life.

3 *Sermon* on ' Salvation by Faith ' ; also that on ' Marks of the New Birth.' Surrender of the will, in William James's terminology, ' regeneration by relaxing,' is ' psychologically indistinguishable from the Lutheran justification by faith and the Wesleyan acceptance of free grace.'—*V.R.E.*, p. 111. This ' relaxing,' however, does not mean passivity : it is a willing to follow another Will.

strength of his years, or when he is old and hoary-haired, God justifieth that ungodly one. . . . Faith, therefore, is the *necessary* condition of justification ; yea, and the *only necessary* condition thereof.' [1] 'I always did, and do still continually affirm, that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to every believer,' Wesley continues. 'But who deny it? Why, all Infidels, . . . all Socinians and Arians, . . . members of the Church of Rome. . . . With these we may rank those even in the Reformed Churches, who are usually termed Mystics. One of the chief of these in the present century, at least in England, was Mr. Law. It is well known that he absolutely and zealously denied the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, as zealously as Robert Barclay, who scruples not to say, " Imputed righteousness !—imputed nonsense ! " The body of the people known by the name of Quakers espouse the same sentiment. Nay, the generality of those who profess themselves members of the Church of England, are either totally ignorant of the matter, and know nothing about imputed righteousness, or deny this and justification by faith together, as destructive of good works.' [2] But, to Wesley, saving faith includes works as its natural outcome or condition ; otherwise it would savour of the Antinomian poison which he abhorred in the later and degenerate Moravian teaching, and be the negation of that sanctification which he declared ought naturally to follow. Justification and sanctification, however, are clearly distinguished in Wesley's theology. 'By justification we are saved from the guilt of sin, and restored to the favour of God ; by sanctification we are saved from the power and root of sin, and restored to the image of God.' [3] It was the powerful enforcement of these truths, joined with a never-failing insistence on the work of the Holy Spirit in connexion with them, that, under God, renewed the face of England in the eighteenth century.

[1] *Sermon* on 'Justification by Faith' ; also that on 'The Scripture Way of Salvation.' See the *Earnest Appeal*, § 23.

[2] *Sermon* on 'The Lord our Righteousness.'

[3] *Sermon* on 'Working out our own Salvation' ; also that on 'The Repentance of Believers.'

XV

THE WORK OF THE SPIRIT IN SANCTIFICATION

'There neither is, nor ever was, in the world, nor ever shall be, the least dram of holiness, but what, flowing from Jesus Christ, is communicated by the Spirit, according to the truth and promise of the Gospel.'—JOHN OWEN.

XV

THE WORK OF THE SPIRIT IN SANCTIFICATION

I

'THE very essence of the Christian religion is the indwelling of the Spirit of Christ.'[1] Full acknowledgment of the truth of this had been made by all schools of Christian thought in the Middle Ages. In the teaching of the Greek and Roman Churches, human nature can be made by the Holy Spirit capable of fulfilling perfectly all requirements of the moral law, even 'venial' sins being unnecessary. In addition, it was held that it is possible for the regenerate to perform good works which are not commanded, but simply counselled by Christ (*opera supererogationis*), and therefore possessing absolute merit. This had been strongly refuted by the various Protestant symbols, the *Thirty-nine Articles*, for instance, stating that 'works of supererogation cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety.'[2] Indeed, 'all that is noble in the theory of supererogatory works is maintained by all sound Protestants; but they make it consistent with the Evangelical covenant by declaring that no such works can be above the requirements of the law interpreted by love, that even these are accepted as wrought by the believer because their imperfection is constantly forgiven for the sake of the Atonement.'[3]

Consideration of the Protestant views of the sanctified life may begin with the *Canons of Dort*. Calvinistic though they are, they contain a comprehensive statement of the renewing work of the Spirit in the hearts of the justified: 'When God carries out this His good pleasure in the elect, or brings about true conversion in them, not only does He feel concerned that the Gospel should be outwardly set forth by them, and does He effectually illuminate their mind by the Holy Spirit,

[1] R. C. Moberly, *Atonement and Personality*, p. 90.
[2] *Art. XIV.*
[3] Pope, *Compendium of Christian Theology*, iii. p. 82.

that they may rightly understand and distinguish what things are of the Spirit of God, but He also, by the efficacy of the same regenerating Spirit, penetrates into the innermost soul of a man, opens the heart that is closed, softens it when hard, imparts new qualities to the will, and produces it as alive from the dead, as good out of evil, as desiring out of not desiring, as obedient out of being stubborn, and impels and strengthens it, that, like a good tree, it may be able to bring forth the fruits of good actions.'[1] No less definite are the Arminians concerning this working of the Holy Spirit's effectual grace, by which, so they affirm, the believer, while on earth, may attain to Christian Perfection—not, so Episcopius observes, as an end in itself, but as an advanced degree of upward progress. Limborch's description of it, as quoted by Dr. Pope,[2] contains the remark that 'it is not sinless or an absolutely perfect obedience, but such as consists in a sincere love of piety, absolutely excluding every habit of sin.' Arminius, while he confesses that he has not thoroughly thought out the subject, at least makes it clear that such a measure of spiritual attainment is due, not to any meritorious human works, but to Divine grace, received internally by faith.[3] The word 'Holy' is, he says, added to the word 'Spirit' in order to indicate 'that He is not only holy in Himself, but also the Sanctifier of all who in any sense are and are called holy.'[4] The Saumur School, influenced particularly by Amyraldus, taught that, in sanctification, the Holy Spirit first enlightens the mind, then enables the soul to follow its higher dictates. Yet there are no startling disagreements between the theologians of Saumur and of Amsterdam when they are speaking of the work of the Holy Spirit in man's deepest life. Some of Cameron's *Sermons* are full of references to such a subject. It is, he contends, only through the sanctifying Spirit that union with Christ is possible.[5] Through Him we appropriate Christ's merits, thereby securing our deliverance. Those whose sins are forgiven the Spirit seals and establishes, filling them with graces. But let any indifference take possession of the believer, and the gracious operations of the Spirit are immediately checked. If only the mass of professing Christians

[1] *Canons of Dort*, iii. § 11. [2] *Compendium*, iii. p. 84. [3] *The Remonstrance*, Art. 5.
[4] *Thesis VI, de Sp. sanct.*, § 2. [5] On John vi. 56.

could be brought to realize the force of these truths! If only the Roman Church as he sees it in France would bring them to realize it! Imposing forms of worship he finds all around him, and he condemns them as formal; 'but,' he says, 'we have chosen another method,' that of spiritual communion with Christ.[1] The indwelling Spirit, he adds with emphasis, must be at the heart of all inward religion and of all real worship.[2]

The sundry debates which figure so prominently in the religious life of England during these two centuries influenced to no appreciable extent the development of so experimental a doctrine. Evidence of this is furnished by the homiletic literature of the period. Andrewes delights to refer to the Spirit of God as 'the sanctifying Spirit,' and this Divine operation is always uppermost in his thought as it was in his life. 'This "Comforter" that "shall abide with us" is,' he observes, 'but a pledge of that bliss and kingdom of His wherein we shall abide with Him eternally.'[3] But pride, lust, and malice keep away the Spirit altogether. 'The dove lights on no carrion.'[4] 'Would the king suffer his picture to be used as we use the image of God in our souls? or his hall to be used as we use the temple of the Holy Ghost, our bodies?'—asks Donne.[5] If we give the Holy Ghost free course, He carries on within us His redeeming and sanctifying office, producing in our life supernatural actions,[6] and leading us on to perfection.[7] Happy is he in whose heart Christ dwells by His Spirit, and who enjoys the constant fellowship of such a guest! 'He that loves the exercise of prayer so earnestly, as that in prayer he feels the vehemence of the Holy Ghost, that man dwells in an everlasting Whitsunday.'[8] The practical effects of this experience constantly commanded the attention of these Protestant divines. Those assembled at Westminster state definitely in their *Confession* that one effect is to destroy 'the dominion of the whole body of sin.'[9] One of their number,

1 'Mais nous avons pris une autre méthode; nous enseignons comme nous avons appris, que la communion avec Christ est spirituelle; . . . qu'il faut adorer en esprit et vérité celui qui est Esprit et Vérité.'

2 *Second Sermon* on John vi. 56.

3 *Sermon* 3 on the Holy Spirit (John xiv. 15, 16).

4 *Sermon* 5 on the Holy Spirit.

5 *Sermon* 28 (John xiv. 26).

6 *Sermon* 31 (Gen. i. 2).

7 *Sermon* 32 (I Cor. xii. 3).

8 *Sermon* 30 (John xiv. 20).

9 xiii. § 1.

Peter Sterry, believes that another effect would be a greater unity among Christians, if such a spiritual experience were to become more prevalent. 'If,' he exclaims, 'the Lord would pour forth His Spirit upon our souls and melt them, how sweetly would they run all into one piece, like gold!'[1] Baxter, at any rate, is convinced that those who are admitted into this intimate relationship with Christ by His Spirit are thereby recipients of special grace.[2]

Throughout the Trinitarian and Unitarian controversies those who strove for the Divinity of Christ and the Divinity and personality of the Holy Spirit, besides, indeed, certain who denied them, did not overlook the sanctifying grace of God in the cleansing and renewing of man's inner life. In this work of renewal, the Holy Spirit, so Pearson affirms, illumines the soul, regenerates it, and so governs our words and actions as that we may please God—so long as we maintain our 'faith in the Holy Ghost.'[3] He, 'as graciously striving within us,' is the One 'unto whom,' says Barrow, 'the purification of our hearts, the mortification of our lusts, the sanctification of our lives, the salvation of our souls, are principally due'; adding, 'We should thus mind the Blessed Spirit of God, and be suitably affected towards Him.'[4] These words must have been specially pointed in the days of the later Stuarts. No reliance upon the atoning merits of Christ in times past will of itself suffice for the spiritual necessities of the present. 'Some think that the love of the Father and blood of the Son will do, without the holiness of the Spirit of God,' Bunyan remarks: 'but,' says he, 'they are deceived.' It is only by the Spirit dwelling within us that 'our graces are maintained in life and vigour.'[5] Christ, so Owen reminds us, bequeathed the Holy Spirit 'to supply His own absence (John xvi. 17), that is, for all the ends of spiritual and eternal life';[6] and the

[1] *Sermon* on 'The Spirit's Conviction of Sin' (John xvi. 8).

[2] *Christian Directory* (pt. i. on *Chr. Ethics*), iii. § 3.

[3] *Exposition of the Creed* (Art. VIII), ii. §§ 2, 3. Pearson's comment on Eph. i. 3, 4, in which our present sealing by the Spirit 'is an earnest of our inheritance,' contains an interesting note on ἀρραβών (Lat. *arrhabo*), with an example from Plautus's *Mostellaria* (iii. 1, § 113), in which a third of a sum of money was given beforehand as part payment. Cf. Wesley, *Sermon* 'On the Holy Spirit' (No. 138).

[4] *Defence of the Blessed Trinity.*

[5] *Saved by Grace.*

[6] *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, p. 173. Cp. Matthew Henry, on John xiv. 26, *Exposition of the N.T.*

sanctification which the Spirit works within man after conversion affects 'the whole spirit, soul, and body.'[1] The entire human nature, with every faculty of the mind, comes within the perfecting process.[2] 'Sanctification . . . is the universal renovation of our natures by the Holy Spirit into the image of God, through Jesus Christ.'[3] This renovation is infinitely more than persuasion: it is 'a real, internal, powerful, physical work,'[4] whereby our natures are renewed at the source and strengthened against actual or inward sin.[5] This takes place as the Spirit increases and strengthens the graces we already possess.[6] Two things Owen desires to be remembered: The first is, as Pearson had already remarked, that 'faith is the instrumental cause of our sanctification (1 Pet. i. 21 f.),'[7] and only in response to our diligence in exercising this can the Holy Spirit operate within us.[8] The second is that, in spite of what may be accomplished, either by other religions or by ethics, sanctification, in this full sense, is joined with, and limited to, the truth and grace of the Gospel (John xvii. 17 ff.).[9] 'All who unfeignedly believe in God through Jesus Christ are sanctified, and no other.'[10] 'To make anything to be our holiness that is not derived from Jesus Christ, I know not what I do more abhor.'[11] Similar testimony is given by Beveridge. 'We partake of the Spirit,' he writes, 'only by virtue of our union to Christ, which union is made by faith. It is the heart of believers into which the Spirit is sent, and wherein Christ and It dwell. . . . Hence, whatsoever a man doth, how well soever he speaks, unless his heart be right with God, he may be confident that he hath not the Spirit of Christ.'[12] But such as are styled by Matthew Henry really good Christians, who, being God's temples, have His Spirit dwelling within them,[13] 'are well armed against the strongest

1 *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, p. 255. 2 *Ibid.*, p. 432. Also p. 499.
3 *Ibid.*, p. 453. Also p. 532—Apart from the Holy Spirit's cleansing, no man shall see God.
4 *Ibid.*, p. 454. 5 *Ibid.*, pp. 517 ff.
6 *Ibid.*, pp. 456 ff. 7 *Ibid.*, p. 488.
8 *Ibid.*, p. 464. So Clagett (*Discourse*, pt. i. vii. 4) states that the graces of the Holy Spirit are bestowed in accordance with the differing spiritual states of men's minds.
9 *Ibid.*, pp. 434 f. 10 *Ibid.*, p. 479.
11 *Ibid.*, p. 489. 12 *Thesaurus Theologicus*, i. (Gal. iv. 6).
13 *Exposition of the N.T.* (Matt. xxiii. 13–33, showing the contrast of *inward* religion).

temptations.'[1] Bull and Howe refer in this connexion to the strong temptations which arise from the fleshly side of man's nature. The former gives the assurance, 'If ye are under the power and guidance of the Spirit of Christ, it is impossible for you to obey these lusts.'[2] This had already been said explicitly by Barrow. Yet Howe is no less explicit for showing perhaps a little more human insight. He writes: 'It should be endeavoured that the passions, which are not to be rooted up (because they are of nature's planting), be yet so discreetly checked and depressed, that they grow not to that enormous tallness as to overtop a man's intellectual power, and cast a dark shadow over his soul.'[3] Hence the necessity of realizing, as Matthew Henry points out, that, even as the gifts, graces, and powers of the Spirit were bestowed upon the disciples at Pentecost, so they are now bestowed on any one who will exercise faith; and the power of the Spirit is more efficacious than the preaching of 'the best ministers.'[4] Let us then 'ask for the Holy Spirit, not only as necessary in order to our praying well, but as inclusive of all the good things we are to pray for; we need no more to make us happy, for the Spirit is the Worker of spiritual life, and the Earnest of eternal life.'[5]

II

Union with God, as attainable through contemplation and self-discipline, continued to be prominent in the thought of 'mystical' divines. Of these, an outstanding example from the Catholic side is Brother Lawrence, the French seventeenth-century monk, who is so well known to modern readers of devotional literature. It was his conviction 'that our sanctification did not depend upon changing our works, but in doing that for God's sake which commonly we do for our own.'[6]

[1] *Exposition of the N.T.* (Lk. iv. 1). [2] *Harmonia Apostolica*, ix.

[3] Rogers, *Life and Character of John Howe*, p. 215.

[4] *Exposition of the N.T.* (Acts ii.).

[5] *Ibid.* (Lk. xi. 13). Cp. Fisher (*Hist. of Chr. Doc.*, p. 387), who describes Hume's standpoint in his *Natural History of Religion* (1757) thus: 'Religion originates in the natural habit to refer events that affect our happiness to unknown causes which the imagination personifies.' Jonathan Edwards would strongly disagree. See his *Religious Affections*.

[6] *The Practice of the Presence of God* (*Fourth Conversation*) (November 25, 1667). [Pub. H. R. Allenson.]

He recognizes that this change of motive is fundamental, and, for a time at least, requires every effort of the will. Holiness is for those only who strive after it resolutely. 'We must always labour at it,' he asserts; 'for, in the spiritual life, not to advance is to go back.'[1] The presence and help of the Holy Spirit, however, greatly diminish the labour as the soul progresses. By continual conversation with God we can and should 'establish ourselves in a sense of His Presence,'[2] which will require 'some diligence'; but 'after a little care we should find His love inwardly excite us to it without any difficulty.'[3] At this stage, presumably, progress becomes almost 'second nature,' for 'those whose spirits are stirred by the breath of the Holy Spirit go forward even in sleep.'[4] Entire sanctification, or union of the soul with God, was held by Molinos and Madame Guyon to be possible in this life, the way to it being by the gradual suppression of the individual consciousness. Even Fénelon came somewhat near to the Quietist position in his *Maxims of the Saints*, and did not hesitate to attack the Jansenists when they disagreed with the ideas of perfection therein contained. Progress in the higher life has been the constant theme of the Quakers. George Fox was insistent on the possibility of entire sanctification for all believers. Barclay, in consolidating Quaker doctrine, set out to expound the process of soul-development on the basis of the New Testament.[5] In fulfilling this purpose, he does not make any clear distinction, as the previous chapter shows, between sanctification and justification. Both are included in the one great process: 'In whom this pure and holy birth is fully brought forth, the body of death and sin comes to be crucified and removed; and their hearts united and subjected to the truth; so as not to obey any suggestions or temptations of the Evil One, and to be free from actual sinning and transgressing of the law of God, and in that respect perfect. Yet doth this perfection still admit of a growth.'[6] Moreover, 'such works as naturally proceed from this spiritual birth and formation of Christ in us are pure and holy, even as the root from whence

1 *The Practice of the Presence of God, Second Letter* (June 1, 1682).
2 *Ibid., First Conversation* (August 3, 1666).
3 *Second Conversation* (September 28, 1666).
4 *Ibid., Second Letter.*
5 See his *Catechism*, chap. ii.
6 *Apology*, prop. 8.

they come; and therefore God accepts them, justifies us in them, and rewards us for them in His own free grace. . . . Wherefore their judgement is false and against the truth who say that the holiest works of the saints are defiled and sinful in the sight of God.'[1] Barclay believes in the possibility not only of resisting grace,[2] but also of falling away from the state of it, 'where the mind doth not most diligently and watchfully attend unto the Lord.'[3] In his *Confession of Faith* (xi.) he asserts that the Holy Spirit will not always strive with men, while in the *Apology* he continues: 'They in whose hearts' the inward grace of God 'hath wrought in part to purify and sanctify them in order to their further perfection, may by disobedience fall from it, turn to wantonness (Jude 4); make shipwreck of faith (1 Tim. i. 19); and, after having tasted of the heavenly gift, and been made partakers of the Holy Ghost, again fall away (Heb. vi. 4 ff.).'[4] Divine grace, however, can so work in the heart of the consistent Christian as to exclude sin altogether: 'such an increase and stability in the truth may in this life be attained, from which there can be no total apostasy.'[5] Such is Barclay's doctrine of entire sanctification. The Pietists, also, maintained a high standard of 'perfection' in their earlier teaching, affirming that such, in the evangelical sense, is the privilege of all in whose life the Divine love is shed abroad; though perhaps they did not emphasize the work of the Holy Spirit in this connexion so constantly as did the early Methodists, nor, on the whole, did they present a perfection so practical.[6] 'The soul,' writes Boehme, 'thirsts after the heavenly holy Father, and He also gives meat and drink to it, feeding it with His Holy Spirit, the spring, source, or fountain of joy.'[7] The influence of the Divine Spirit on personal behaviour is the special concern of his admirer, William Law. 'As sure, therefore, as there is any wisdom in praying for the Spirit of God, so sure is it,' he declares, 'that we are to make that Spirit the rule of all our actions.' A marked difference should appear every day between the lives of Christians and non-Christians, if the religion of the former be real.[8] The devotional life within should find expression

[1] *Apology*, prop. 7. [2] *Ibid.*, props. 6 and 9. [3] *Ibid.*, prop. 8.
[4] *Ibid.*, prop. 9: see also props. 5, 6, and 8. [5] *Ibid.*, prop. 9.
[6] Note what Dr. Workman calls the 'social factor' in Wesley's doctrine of 'perfect love.'
[7] *Aurora*, § 3. [8] *Serious Call*, chap. i.

without, both as a proof of the genuineness of one's spiritual experience and as a means whereby it may be definitely enriched. 'As all Christians are to use the same holy and heavenly devotions, as they are all with the same earnestness to pray for the Spirit of God, so is it a sufficient proof that all orders of people are, to the utmost of their power, to make their life agreeable to that one Spirit, for which they are all to pray.'[1] One certain preparation for the full reception of the Spirit is self-denial, particularly in the form of early rising![2] For whether we are rich or poor,[3] we are meant 'to be temples of the Holy Ghost,' and 'to live according to His holy inspirations.'[4]

In face of the grave moral need of his day, Wesley proclaimed a doctrine of 'Scriptural holiness' in which the operation of the Holy Spirit never ceased to receive the utmost emphasis. From the beginning of his evangelical ministry, he insisted on Christian perfection in this life as a possibility for all believers who exercise faith to this end. At conversion the Holy Spirit sheds abroad His love in the heart and undertakes the work of gradually destroying the forces of the lower nature. 'At the same time that we are justified,' says Wesley, 'yea, in that very moment, sanctification begins. In that instant we are born again, born from above, born of the Spirit: there is a *real* as well as a *relative* change. We are inwardly renewed by the power of God. We feel "the love of God shed abroad in our heart by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us," producing love to all mankind, and more especially to the children of God; expelling the love of the world, the love of pleasure, of ease, of honour, of money; together with pride, anger, self-will, and every other evil temper; in a word, changing the earthly, sensual, devilish mind into "the mind which was in Christ Jesus."'[5] Thus 'the title Holy, applied to the Spirit of God, does not only denote that He is holy in His own Nature, but that He makes us so,'[6] enabling us to 'fulfil precepts even more spiritual'

1 *Serious Call*, chap. x.
2 *Ibid.*, chap. xiv.
3 *Ibid.*, chaps. xx. and xxi.
4 *Ibid.*, chap. x.
5 *Sermon* on 'The Scripture Way of Salvation.' This is a spiritual experience which embraces 'the instinctive emotions.' See Dr. Hadfield, in *The Spirit*, &c., pp. 87 ff.
6 *Sermon* on 'Grieving the Holy Spirit.'

than the demands of the old legal dispensation.[1] This He does in response to faith. 'I have continually testified in private and in public,' Wesley states, 'that we are sanctified as well as justified by faith. And indeed the one of those great truths does exceedingly illustrate the other. Exactly as we are justified by faith, so are we sanctified by faith. Faith is the condition, and the only condition, of sanctification, exactly as it is of justification. It is the *condition*: none is sanctified but he that believes; without faith no man is sanctified. And it is the *only condition*: this alone is sufficient for sanctification. Every one that believes is sanctified, whatever else he has or has not. In other words, no man is sanctified till he believes: every man when he believes is sanctified.'[2] Sanctification is thus wrought in the soul on the basis of the atoning work of Christ. 'The incarnation, preaching, and death of Jesus Christ were designed to represent, proclaim, and purchase for us this gift of the Spirit.'[3] 'Those who "have redemption through His blood" are properly said to be "in Him." For they dwell in Christ, and Christ in them. They are joined unto the Lord in one Spirit.' Wesley then proceeds: 'These are they who indeed "walk after the Spirit."' Accordingly they show 'the genuine fruits of the Spirit of God'; otherwise, if they now commit sin, they have 'no part or lot in this matter.'[4] The indwelling of the Spirit, while it delivers at once from the guilt and the power of sin, gives no immediate deliverance from its existence within the soul[5]: and 'if a believer wilfully sins, he casts away his faith; neither is it possible he should have justifying faith again, without previously repenting.'[6] If, on the other hand, believers experience 'inward sin still remaining,' without giving way to it, it is no cause for disquiet. 'Fret not thyself because of ungodliness, though it still remain in thy heart.'[7] But 'how naturally,' Wesley continues, 'do those who experience such a change imagine that all sin is gone; that it is utterly rooted out of their heart, and has no more any place therein! How easily do they draw that inference, "I

[1] *Sermon* on 'The Holy Spirit.' (See *Sermons* 35 and 36, both on 'The Law established through Faith.')
[2] *Sermon* on 'The Scripture Way of Salvation.' [3] *Sermon* on 'The Holy Spirit.'
[4] *Sermon* on 'The First Fruits of the Spirit.' [5] *Sermon* on 'Sin in Believers.'
[6] *Minutes of the Conference*, 1744. [7] *Sermon* on 'The First Fruits of the Spirit.'

feel no sin ; therefore I *have* none : It does not *stir* ; therefore it does not *exist* : It has no *motion* ; therefore it has no *being*." But it is seldom long before they are undeceived, finding sin was only suspended, not destroyed. . . . They feel in themselves sometimes pride or self-will, sometimes anger or unbelief. They find one or more of these frequently *stirring* in their heart, though not *conquering*. . . . From the time of our being born again, the gradual work of sanctification takes place. We are enabled, " by the Spirit, to mortify the deeds of the body," of our evil nature ; and as we are more and more dead to sin, we are more and more alive to God. We go on from grace to grace, while we are careful to " abstain from all appearance of evil," and are " zealous of good works," . . . and deny ourselves every pleasure that does not lead us to God. It is thus,' observes Wesley, ' that we wait for entire sanctification ; [1] for a full salvation from all our sins —from pride, self-will, anger, unbelief ; or, as the Apostle expresses it, " go on unto perfection." But what is Perfection ? The word has various senses : here it means Perfect Love. It is love excluding sin ; love filling the heart, taking up the whole capacity of the soul. It is love " rejoicing evermore, praying without ceasing, in everything giving thanks." ' [2] ' Pure love reigning alone in the heart and life—this is the whole of Scriptural perfection.' [3]

Wesley's constant insistence on the power of *love*, and the need of attaining to this state of its human ' perfection,' is sufficient indication that his doctrine of entire sanctification has no concern with a perfection which is absolute, or sinless.[4] True, the declaration was made that ' he that is in the full sense born of God, cannot commit sin,' [5] and this receives support in the course of Wesley's *Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion*. But what perfection is it that we preach ? he asks. ' The term you cannot object to ; because it is scriptural. All the difficulty is to fix the meaning of it according to the Word of God. And this we have done again and again, declaring to

1 Similarly in *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection* : ' *Q.* How are we to wait for this change ? *A.* Not in careless indifference, or indolent inactivity ; but in vigorous, universal obedience,' &c.

2 *Sermon* on ' The Scripture Way of Salvation.'

3 *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection.*

4 See his *Sermon* on ' The Spirit of Bondage and of Adoption.'

5 *Minutes of the Conference*, 1744.

all the world that Christian perfection does not imply an exemption from ignorance, or mistake, or infirmities, or temptations; but that it does imply the being so crucified with Christ as to be able to testify, "I live not, but Christ liveth in me" (Gal. ii. 20), and hath "purified my heart by faith" (Acts xv. 9); . . . and, in a word, "the loving the Lord our God with all our heart, and serving Him with all our strength." Now, is it possible for any who believe the Scripture to deny one tittle of this? You cannot. You dare not. You would not for the world. You know it is the pure Word of God. And this is the whole of what we preach.'[1] 'Christian Perfection, therefore, does not imply (as some men seem to have imagined) an exemption either from ignorance, or mistake, or infirmities, or temptations. Indeed, it is only another term for holiness. They are two names for the same thing. Thus, every one that is holy is, in the Scripture sense, perfect. Yet we may observe that neither in this respect is there any absolute perfection on earth.'[2] For this reason, adds Wesley, 'sinless perfection is a phrase I never use.'

'But,' Wesley inquires in conclusion, 'does God work this great work in the soul gradually or instantaneously? Perhaps it may be gradually wrought in some; I mean in this sense, they do not advert to the particular moment wherein sin ceases to be. But it is infinitely desirable, were it the will of God, that it should be done instantaneously; that the Lord should destroy sin "by the breath of His mouth," in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye. And so He generally does; a plain fact, of which there is evidence enough to satisfy any unprejudiced person.'[3] Deliverance from sin, therefore, regarded as the culmination of the sanctifying process, 'is given instan-

[1] *Earnest Appeal*, §§ 55, 56.

[2] *Sermon* on 'Christian Perfection.' In this connexion these words of Sir Oliver Lodge at the British Association Meeting, 1923, are of interest: 'Man is a comparatively recent comer to the conflict, and is far from perfect, but he has in him the seeds of majesty. . . . He has infinite possibilities of development, and when the work is complete through the slow process of the ages, we shall see that the product is worth all the labour and sacrifice and pain which have been necessary to bring it about.' Even so, Sir Arthur Keith gives us to understand that man in his evolution 'will remain much the same imperfect, lovable being as he now is.' The idea of perfection appears to be viewed in the rational sense, as referring to intellectual dominance. Spiritual dominance is another matter, derived, as Wesley would argue, from 'the labour and sacrifice and pain' of the one Perfect Man, and the 'entire renewal' wrought by His Spirit.

[3] *Sermon* on 'The Scripture Way of Salvation.'

taneously, in one moment': yet, as Barclay also asserted, the believer 'still grows in grace, in the knowledge of Christ, in the love and image of God; and will do so, not only till death, but to all eternity.'[1] Whereas Barclay did not admit the possibility of 'total apostasy' from the state of *entire* sanctification, Wesley utters a grave warning to the effect that strict self-discipline, earnest prayer, and 'a close attendance on all the ordinances of God,' are essential to the maintenance of even so advanced a state as this, adding that, if any one dream of keeping it in any other way, 'he deceiveth his own soul.'[2] In any case, 'that daughter of pride, enthusiasm,' must continually be guarded against by the cultivation of humility, the exercise of reason, the study of the Scriptures, consultation with other Christians, and, above all, by that love which is 'the fulfilling of the law.' Dr. Pope considers that the Methodist doctrine of Entire Sanctification 'connects the fulfilment of the evangelical law with the effusion of Divine love in the heart more strictly and consistently than any other system of teaching'; also that it 'is the only one that has consistently and boldly maintained the possibility of the destruction of the carnal mind, or the inbred sin of our fallen nature.' 'The combination of the two elements, the negative annihilation of the principle of sin and the positive effusion of perfect love, is,' he declares, 'peculiar to Methodist theology.'[3]

[1] *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection.* [2] *Ibid.*
[3] *Compendium of Christian Theology*, iii. pp. 96 f.

XVI

THE WITNESS OF THE SPIRIT

αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα συνμαρτυρεῖ τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν ὅτι ἐσμὲν τέκνα Θεοῦ.

'I observed many years ago . . . "By the testimony of the Spirit I mean an inward impression on the soul, whereby the Spirit of God immediately and directly witnesses to my spirit that I am a child of God; that Jesus Christ hath loved me, and given Himself for me; that all my sins are blotted out, and I, even I, am reconciled to God." After twenty years' further consideration, I see no cause to retract any part of this.'—JOHN WESLEY.

XVI

THE WITNESS OF THE SPIRIT

I

THE Council of Trent had pronounced definitely against any direct witness of the Holy Spirit to the spirit of the individual believer, of his present salvation and acceptance with God. 'The Romanist conceptions of salvation by merit, sacramental grace, and probation could lead to no other conclusion.'[1] Some kind of Assurance is, indeed, regarded as being derived, in a measure, from the Sacrament of Penance,[2] also from separate penances and indulgences. The Greek Church, however, partly on account of its very disbelief in both penances[3] and indulgences, attaches greater importance, in this connexion, to the Sacrament of Penance, which is described by Kritopoulos as 'a witness of the abiding presence of the Holy Spirit in the soul.'[4] Such a witness, though necessarily occasional and fitful, and dependent on confession to the priest,[5] is perhaps the nearest approach to the doctrine of 'personal Assurance' found outside the Protestant system. Within that system, Arminianism adhered to this doctrine tenaciously. Arminius himself holds that assurance of salvation may be granted directly by the Holy Spirit to every true believer, 'if his heart condemn him not,'[6] and Episcopius and Limborch concur.[7] Calvinism, which had influenced Anglican as well as Continental theology during the sixteenth century, taught that an Assurance may be similarly vouchsafed, but only to the elect, and then not always as testifying to *personal* salvation. It taught, further, that this assurance of the elect cannot be

[1] See my *Holy Spirit in the Mediaeval Church*, pp. 352 f.

[2] The Council of Trent had declared (sess. xiv.): 'Si quis dixerit, in catholica ecclesia poenitentiam non esse vere et proprie sacramentum pro fidelibus, quoties post baptismum in peccata labuntur, ipsi Deo reconciliandis a Christo institutum, anathema sit.'

[3] Gavin, *Greek Orthodox Thought*, p. 369.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 358.

[5] *Conf. Orth.*: . . . . ὁπoῦ παρευθὺς ὡς αν πάρῃ τὴν συγχώρησίν του, ἀφέωνται τὰ ἁμαρτήματα τὴν ὥραν ἐκείνην ὅλα ἀπὸ τὸν Θεὸν διὰ τοῦ ἱερέως.

[6] See R. N. Young, *Witness of the Spirit*, p. 92.

[7] Limborch, *Theol. Chr.*, vi 7.

lost.[1] The somewhat rigid expression of it presented in the *Westminster Confession* allowed, with some ambiguity, that a true believer, 'being enabled by the Spirit to know the things which are freely given him of God,' may, 'without extraordinary revelation, in the right use of ordinary means, attain to this infallible assurance.'[2] The majority of moderate Calvinists, however, said as little in their homiletic writings about confining this privilege to the elect as had the writers of the Anglican *Homilies*, whatever might have been their actual creed. In Cameron's view, the new life of the soul, of which God is the source, and which is developed from faithful obedience to the mind He enlightens, 'is that life in virtue of which the Spirit, in coming to quicken us, makes it possible for us to cry with assurance "Abba, Father."'[3] We can know of our deliverance from sin by the Spirit's application to our hearts of the merits of the Blood of Christ.[4]

Prompted by Hooker, Protestant divines in England during the seventeenth century gave, on the whole, increasingly cordial approval to a doctrine of Assurance. In regard to such questions as the right use of wealth, and sundry problems of daily behaviour, Donne advocates the possession of 'a rectified conscience,' the testimony of which, he says, is required before a man can truly possess 'the comfort of the Holy Ghost.' Baxter refers to a more direct testimony of the Spirit in the course of his *Christian Directory*: 'The same Spirit helpeth believers in the exercise of grace to *feel* it and *discern* the sincerity of it in themselves. . . . The same Spirit helpeth them hereupon to conclude that they are justified and reconciled to God, and have right to all the benefits of His Covenant. Also He assisteth them actually to rejoice in the discerning of this conclusion.' After speaking of the necessity of faith for such an experience, Baxter proceeds: 'The Spirit witnesseth that we are the children of God. The word "witness" is put here principally for evidence. If any one question our adoption, the witness or evidence which we must produce to prove it is the Spirit of Jesus sanctifying us and dwelling in us.'[5] So the essence of this 'witness' is not

[1] *Canons of Dort*, v. §§ 9, 10.
[2] xviii. &c.
[3] *Sermon* on John vi. 53–55.
[4] *Sermon* on John vi. 56.
[5] Pt. i., on *Christian Ethics*, iii. § 3.

a direct testimony of the Holy Spirit distinct from the testimony of our own spirit, so much as a sense that the Holy Spirit is helping us to produce a testimony purely from the human side. This He does by granting us 'a state of filial affection towards Him,' even before there is any consciousness of adoption. Presumably such an experience is for the 'elect,' for, Baxter adds, God gives the Spirit 'only to His children.' Chillingworth, however, refers to some Assurance of an inward character which is given to sincere believers by the Holy Spirit over and above all evidence presented by their own spirit. 'The Spirit of God,' he writes, 'being implored by devout and humble prayer and sincere obedience, may and will, by degrees, advance His servants higher, and gives them a certainty of adherence beyond their certainty of evidence. . . . To those that believe, and live according to their faith, He gives by degrees the Spirit of obsignation and confirmation, which makes them know what they did but believe.'[1] Similarly John Smith, the Cambridge Platonist, after alluding to 'the testimony of our conscience' as 'our continual feast,' describes 'the testimony of the Spirit' as 'a superadded taste out of God's right hand, as it were a piece of heaven in the soul . . . chasing away all our dark and gloomy doubtings before it.'[2] Pearson and Barrow express themselves in like manner. 'It is the office of the Holy Ghost,' declares the former, 'to assure us of the adoption of sons, to create in us a sense of the paternal love of God toward us, to give us an earnest of our everlasting inheritance. As, therefore, we are born again by the Spirit, so we are also assured by the same Spirit of our adoption.'[3] The latter observes that the Holy Spirit, having qualified us to be the sons of God by His grace, 'assureth us that we are so by His comfortable testimony.'[4]

These suggestions and assertions now received confirmation, on the one hand, in a great work of experimental religion, and, on the other hand, in a great work of theology. In Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, Christian at the Cross receives from the third Shining One 'a mark upon his forehead,' and

[1] *Religion of Protestants*, i. 9.
[2] *Select Discourses*, 449, 450 (quoted by R. Newton Young, *Witness of the Spirit*, p. 73).
[3] *Exposition of the Creed* (Art. VIII), ii. § 5.
[4] *A Defence of the Blessed Trinity*; also his *Sermon* on 'The Gift of the Holy Ghost.'

'a roll with a seal upon it, which he bid him look on as he ran, and that he should give it in at the celestial gate. . . . Then Christian gave three leaps for joy, and went on singing.' Manifestly this refers to the 'witness' or the 'seal' of the Holy Spirit. The incident of the losing of the roll in the arbour, which soon follows, clearly portrays the recovery of the 'witness' after a short period of doubt. 'Who can tell how joyful the man was when he had gotten his roll again? For this roll was the assurance of his life, and acceptance at the desired haven. . . . Oh, how nimbly now did he go up the rest of the hill!' Thus Bunyan endorses not only Romans viii. 16, but also the truths implied in the Apostle's question to the disciples at Ephesus, in Acts xix. 2. Such a direct witness of the Spirit is upheld by Owen in his great work *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, in which he asserts that the Holy Spirit bears witness with our spirits by 'some such act of His as evidenceth itself to be from Him immediately unto them that are concerned in it.'[1] But he is anxious, quite rightly, to show that Assurance is not of the *essence* of saving faith, and that, particularly, salvation itself is not by feeling rather than by faith. 'It is one thing,' he says, 'to have holiness really thriving in any soul, another for that soul to know it and to be satisfied in it; and these things may be separated.' There is a self-satisfaction which is entirely remote from inward holiness. The duty of sincere believers is to *believe* that holiness is increasing in them 'when they perceive it not,' for it is 'a thing that is to be believed,' since it is 'the subject of so many Gospel promises.' The accomplishment of these promises 'depends on God's faithfulness, and not on our sense of it. Where, therefore, we do not openly lay any obstruction against it, as in the case now mentioned, we may, we ought to believe that they are fulfilled towards us, although we are not continually sensible thereof.' It is incumbent on us to grow in holiness, and God will help us so to do, however little we may be conscious of His working. And a person who, on this ground, quietly believes in a growth of holiness in himself is perhaps safer even than some who profess to feel it! After all, adds Owen, the Christian life is a life of faith, and it ill becomes any Christian to succumb to 'vain elation

[1] p. 234

of mind.' In the life of the Spirit, whose method of working is usually secret, 'we live by faith, and not at all by sense.'[1] Yet Owen would have been among the first to assert that no travesty of this 'witness,' such as could account for 'vain elation,' should be allowed to cast doubt upon the possibility of the real experience itself. At best, feelings are not always reliable, and purely physical causes are often enough to overshadow the religious consciousness. Salvation by feeling is altogether out of the question. It is clear, therefore, that these sentiments of Owen's need not be construed as qualifying his undoubted belief in a direct Witness of the Spirit, but simply as a necessary caution, which all Christians would do well to remember.

II

From the time of the publication of Owen's book, the doctrine of a direct Assurance was destined to meet with a more critical reception in England, especially in Anglican circles. In the fifth chapter of the first part of his *Discourse*, which bears the heading 'Concerning pretended gifts of the Spirit,' Clagett comments on Owen's moderate views in a manner which cannot conceal his prejudice. Fastening on Luke xi. 13 ('How much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him?'), from which, he says, Owen infers 'that we are not true believers till we are thus assured,' he declares that it is impossible to conclude from it 'that an absolute assurance that we shall be saved is obtainable by us while we are upon the trial of our faith and obedience. My reason is,' he continues, 'because this assurance is neither needful as a condition of salvation, nor as a motive to our duty, nor as a means of comfort in the performance of it. . . . Wherefore a man must be actually in a state of salvation before he can be assured that he shall be saved: but now, if assurance be a necessary condition of being saved, then, till we are assured, we are not in a state of salvation. So that, if ever we be saved upon these terms, we must either be assured before

[1] *Concerning the Holy Spirit*, pp. 470 ff. Cp. C. W. Emmet, in *The Spirit*, &c., pp. 191 f.: 'The reality and closeness of our contact with the Divine Personality does not depend on, or always vary very closely with, our emotional sense of this contact.' The influence of God 'may be very real, even where there is but little consciousness of it.'

we are assured ; or be in a state of salvation before we are in a state of salvation.' This is logical reasoning, if only the premises were correct. But Owen neither drew such a conclusion from Luke xi. 13—as any careful perusal of his book will prove—nor did he ever say that Assurance is ' a necessary condition of being saved,' but rather the opposite, as has already appeared. Again, Clagett's belief that Assurance is needless, even unprofitable, as a motive to duty, in that it would rob us of the motive-power of fear (he quotes Luke xii. 5), shows a curious forgetfulness of the motive-power of love, whereby all fear is cast out (1 John iv. 18). Moreover, in his statement that ' the Gospel will afford us no other comfort than that which depends upon the performances of our duty,' he overlooks not only all those inner ministrations of the Comforter which are specially precious when outward ' performances ' of duty are impossible, but also the whole essence of the Christian religion, which is a life ' hid with Christ in God ' (Col. iii. 3). Clagett had the impression that the Assurance which had received the sanction of Owen was like the assurance of a traveller who knows that he is in the right way to his destination, and is, in addition, ' infallibly assured that nothing can possibly turn him out of the way.' [1] Such an addition, however, involving a belief in final perseverance, is an unwarrantable deduction from Owen's writings, and simply serves to show further how mistaken was Clagett's impression of the doctrine as it had been guardedly put forward by other notable divines beside Owen. His own interpretation of the Witness of the Spirit, referred to in Rom. viii. 16, is that it is merely a ' public testimony ' that true Christians are sons of God.[2]

In his sermon on ' The Witness of the Spirit,' Bishop Bull casts doubt on the possibility of any direct and individual witness, asserting that it is through the reason that the Holy Spirit chooses to operate. It may be that the prevailing atmosphere of debate occasioned by the current discussions of the doctrine of the Trinity influenced him in forming this judgement. Wesley, however, does not hesitate to characterize this sermon of his as ' full of gross perversions of Scripture, and manifest contradictions both to Scripture and experience.' [3]

[1] *Discourse concerning the Operations of the Holy Spirit*, pt. i. v. 2.
[2] *Ibid.*, 5. [3] R. Newton Young, *Witness of the Spirit* (1882), pp. 50 f.

South gives some credence to Assurance, referring to it in one of his sermons as ' a rarity covered from the inspection of the world, a secret that none can know but God and the person that is blessed with it.' He adds the remark that ' every believer lives upon an inward provision of comfort that the world is a stranger to,' [1] but it is improbable that this alludes to Assurance as here understood. A direct witness of the Spirit as to personal acceptance with God remains a ' rarity.' So also does it in Howe's conception. In his treatise *On Delighting in God*, he observes that the new life in God does not mean any ' enthusiastical assurance,' or ' such a testification of the love of God to the soul as excludes any reference to an external revelation, or the exercise of our own enlightened reason and judgement thereupon'; but ' such a manifestation as is always in accordance with the Divine Word, and ordinarily employs that as its instrument.' Howe allows that it cannot therefore be assumed that ' God *never* doth immediately testify His own special love to holy souls without the intervention of some part of His external Word,' [2] but, in his opinion, this is the exception rather than the rule. Thomas Sherlock (1678–1761), Bishop of London, son of the famous Dean of that name, deals with the subject in one of his *Discourses preached at the Temple Church*,[3] which were published during his lifetime between 1754 and 1758. ' 'Tis matter of great dispute,' he says, ' what sort of evidence the Apostle here means, and what kind of certainty arises from it. Some have placed this evidence among the gifts of the Spirit, and supposed it to be given on purpose to assure the elect of the certainty of their salvation. Others maintain that no man, unless it be specially revealed to him by God, can ever know that he is in a state of security in this life : and this opinion was received and confirmed by the Council of Trent, as may be seen at large in the sixth Session.' As for himself, he sees in the text (Rom. viii. 16), not one witness only, ' the Spirit of Adoption,' ' which is maintained by Grotius and Crellius, and some others ' ; but two witnesses, the Holy Spirit of God and man's ' own mind and conscience.' Now the Apostle says to us : ' By the Spirit

1 R. Newton Young, *Witness of the Spirit* (1882), p. 93.
2 Rogers, *Life and Character of John Howe*, p. 244.
3 Vol. i., *Discourse* 8 (on Rom. viii. 16) (1st ed.).

you obey the same law, and the Spirit of God and your spirit agree to give you the utmost assurance of being the children of God. You are no longer in the sad condition before described, the mind leaning one way, and the flesh another ; . . . for the Spirit, by which you are now ruled, consents to your mind, and is bent to perform the same things which the mind approves.' These evidences ' must both meet to give us the assurance we expect ' ; and, ' where either of these is wanting, the evidence of the other avails nothing.' There is ' the evidence of our own spirit that we do indeed love and approve the law of God,' and ' the evidence of the Spirit of God working in us by obedience.' ' Hence,' he concludes, ' it appears that the evidence of the Spirit is not any secret inspiration, or any Assurance conveyed to the mind of the faithful ; but 'tis the evidence of works, such as by the Spirit we perform : and therefore the only sign of sanctification is holiness, and the only mark of grace is to obey from the heart the Word of God ; and therefore they err, not knowing the Scriptures, who from this or the like passages imagine that the Spirit ever gives, or was ever designed to give, inward Assurance or certainty to men of their final state.' At the same time, Sherlock observes, ' 'tis certain that some go too far on the other side, by denying that any man may know himself to be in a state of grace : for all the children of God are in a state of grace, and the evidence of the Spirit of God and our own spirit may make us certain, where they concur, as they ought to do, that we are the children of God (1 John iii. 21).' ' But, lastly,' he adds, ' this certainty does not extend to our future and final salvation ; for to be in a state of grace is to be heir of salvation : but an heir may be defeated, if by any after-act he incapacitates himself to inherit. In a word, a state of grace may be lost ; he that is the child of God may cease to be the child of God : and therefore being certain and confident that you are now in a state of grace cannot make you certain of your salvation ; but you must still " work out your salvation with fear and trembling." . . . Therefore 'tis great presumption to talk of security. Our certainty reaches to our present condition, which is enough to keep our minds easy and contented.' Bishop Sherlock's teaching shows a definite advance toward the position taken up by Wesley. Wesley, however, would have been unable to

accept the statement that the evidence of the Spirit is the evidence of works, and not an Assurance conveyed to the mind. He was convinced that it *is* such an Assurance, and that good works are the natural evidence of its genuineness. At the same time, Sherlock's contribution, acknowledging as it does the principle of an Assurance available directly for all believers, is notable as coming from an unexpected quarter. Undoubtedly the *theological* attitude of the Church of England in the eighteenth century was unfavourable to this doctrine. 'Although I cannot admit,' writes Horsley, 'that the Articles of our Church, in the doctrinal part, affirm the strict tenets of Calvinism, yet they are in this part what, as I conceive, no true Calvinist would scruple to subscribe';[1] and Calvinism had never favoured Assurance as the privilege of all believers.[2] Within Nonconformity, on the other hand, the doctrine had been steadily gaining ground, even though its progress had been comparatively slow. 'It is but too plain,' observes Horsley, 'that Calvinism among the Dissenters is almost extinguished.'[3]

It was not to be expected that the doctrine of Assurance would receive much encouragement from philosophers, one of the foremost of whom could put forward '*De omnibus dubitandum est*' as his first proposition. Nor did Butler's famous maxim—'probability is the very guide of life'—fail to induce an adverse judgement in his mind whenever this subject was brought to his notice, useful as that maxim was in counteracting Deistic speculations. He strongly deprecated anything which savoured of religious enthusiasm. 'Sir,' he once said to John Wesley, 'the pretending to extraordinary revelations and gifts of the Holy Ghost is a horrid thing, a very horrid thing'; and he set down in the *Analogy* (ii. 7) his conviction that the powers of enthusiasm and of disease 'operate in a like manner.' While, then, the Evangelical Revival, largely through its insistent appeal to the religious consciousness, was succeeding to a great extent in banishing the very irreligion which Butler deplored, 'the religious consciousness' did 'not receive from

1 *Tracts in Controversy with Dr. Priestley*, p. 435.
2 *The Holy Spirit in the Mediaeval Church*, p. 353.
3 *Tracts*, p. 442.

him the slightest consideration.'[1] But, though this may be true of his life-work, there exists, on Venn's authority, an account of his last moments, in which his own religious consciousness manifestly received a most comforting personal Assurance. When lying on his death-bed, he summoned his chaplain, and said to him: 'Though I have endeavoured to avoid sin, and to please God to the utmost of my power, yet, from the consciousness of perpetual infirmities, I am still afraid to die.' 'My lord,' said the chaplain, 'you have forgotten that Jesus Christ is a Saviour.' 'True,' was the answer, 'but how shall I know that He is a Saviour for me?' 'My lord,' replied the chaplain, 'it is written, "Him that cometh to Me I will in no wise cast out."' 'True,' said Butler, 'and I am surprised that, though I have read that Scripture a thousand times over, I never felt its virtue till this moment; and now I die happy.'

III

It was natural for Mysticism to lay stress on present Assurance. 'In mystic states,' remarks William James, 'we both become one with the Absolute, and we become aware of our oneness.'[2] Degenerate Mysticism in its varied forms shows this feeling of oneness developed into unbalanced subjectivism, which rightly brought upon it the condemnation for 'enthusiasm' pronounced by Churchmen and philosophers.[3] The Illuminati, a sect of Spanish Mystics, presumed to be able to dispense with the conditions of salvation laid down in the New Testament[4]: and Quietism, in suppressing the self which alone could be the object of Assurance,[5] had not even a place for a doctrine of Assurance at all. Quakerism, as a type of true Mysticism, was somewhat inclined to allow the *whole* evidence for Assurance to be internal; yet an essential relationship always existed between its doctrine of the 'inner light' and

Encycl. Brit., art. 'Joseph Butler.' It may be noted that Jonathan Edwards, n his sermon on 'The Reality of Spiritual Light' (1734), acknowledged a special grace by which God gives immediate illumination to the soul.

[2] *Varieties of Religious Experience*, p. 419.

[3] See the Historical Introduction, pp. 44 ff.

[4] *The Holy Spirit in the Mediaeval Church*, p. 250.

[5] André alludes to the Quietist description of this self-suppression as 'Christian Perfection.' See art. 'Quietism' in the *Encycl. Brit.* by Viscount St. Cyres.

the doctrine of Assurance as generally understood. In his *Apology* Barclay asserts that there is an assurance of salvation given by the Spirit in response to faith, which will become more and more marked as faith merges into love.[1] This assurance, which is imparted by 'the redemption wrought by Christ *in* us,' follows 'the redemption performed and accomplished by Christ *for* us, in His crucified body without us.' 'By the second [the inward redemption], we witness this capacity [vouchsafed by the outward redemption] brought into act, whereby, receiving and not resisting the purchase of His death, to wit, the light, spirit, and grace of Christ revealed in us, we witness and possess a real, true, and inward redemption from the power and prevalency of sin, and so come to be truly and really redeemed, justified, and made righteous, and to a sensible union and friendship with God.'[2]

As the ideals of the Moravians began to decline, the Assurance which they constantly preached seemed to take upon itself the guise of self-satisfaction. That nothing of the kind could be laid at the door of that wise theologian and leader of theirs, Augustus Spangenberg, is abundantly clear from the entry in Wesley's *Journal*, under February 7, 1736, in which is recorded his memorable conversation with the future leader of the Evangelical Revival. Wesley writes: 'Mr. Oglethorpe returned from Savannah with Mr. Spangenberg, one of the pastors of the Germans. I soon found what spirit he was of; and asked his advice with regard to my own conduct. He said, "My brother, I must first ask you one or two questions. Have you the witness within yourself? Does the Spirit of God bear witness with your spirit, that you are a child of God?" I was surprised, and knew not what to answer. He observed it, and asked, "Do you know Jesus Christ?" I paused, and said, "I know He is the Saviour of the world." "True," replied he; "but do you know He has saved you?" I answered, "I hope He has died to save me." He only added,

1 Prop. 3.

2 Prop. 7. On the phrase '*come to be* truly and really redeemed' cp. Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, p. 52, where it is observed that the Johannine usage of the terms *re* 'knowledge' never includes the word γνῶσις; since, in the Apostle's mind, 'eternal life is not γνῶσις, knowledge as a possession, but the state of acquiring knowledge (ἵνα γινώσκωσιν).' Also see Otto, *Idea of the Holy*, p. 172: 'The experience must come, not by demonstration, but by pure *contemplation*, through the mind submitting itself unreservedly to a pure "impression" of the object.'

" Do you know yourself ? " I said, " I do." But I fear they were vain words.'

IV

Wesley's ' evangelical conversion,' when there came the experience of his own Assurance, followed at Whitsuntide, 1738. The well-known entry in his *Journal* under May 24 of that year reads as follows : ' In the evening I went very unwillingly to a society [1] in Aldersgate Street, where one was reading Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans. About a quarter before nine, while he was describing the change which God works in the heart through faith in Christ, I felt my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone, for salvation : and an assurance was given me, that He had taken away my sins, even mine, and saved me from the law of sin and death. I began to pray with all my might for those who had in a more especial manner despitefully used me and persecuted me. I then testified openly to all there, what I now first felt in my heart.' Referring to this experience later, Wesley says : ' The Spirit itself bore witness to my spirit that I was a child of God, gave me an evidence hereof, and I immediately cried, Abba, Father ! And this I did—and so did you—before I reflected on, or was conscious of, any fruit of the Spirit. It was from this testimony received, that love, joy, peace, and the whole fruit of the Spirit flowed.' [2]

To Bishop Butler, whose observations in conversation with him clearly implied a charge of ' enthusiasm,' Wesley made answer : ' I pretend to no extraordinary revelations or gifts of the Holy Ghost : none but what every Christian may receive, and ought to expect and pray for.' [3] Yet Assurance, as the privilege of all believers, certainly did not commend itself to the majority of Christian ministers, nor, on that account principally, was it enshrined in the belief of most of the members of the Churches, whether of the Establishment or of Dissent. Shortly after Wesley's interview with Butler, he

[1] A society in connexion with the Church of England. So J. H. Rigg, *The Churchmanship of John Wesley*, pp. 52 ff., and *The Living Wesley*, p. 119 ; also *A New History of Methodism*, i. p. 199.

[2] *Second Sermon* on ' The Witness of the Spirit.'

[3] Jonathan Crowther, *History of the Wesleyan Methodists*, p. 38. Crowther reports the whole interview.

conversed with his mother on the subject, the entry in the *Journal* bearing the date September 3, 1739: 'I talked largely with my mother, who told me that, till a short time since, she had scarce heard such a thing mentioned as the having forgiveness of sins now, or God's Spirit bearing witness with our spirit: much less did she imagine that this was the common privilege of all true believers. "Therefore," said she, "I never durst ask for it myself. But two or three weeks ago, while my son Hall was pronouncing those words, in delivering the cup to me, 'The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee,' the words struck through my heart, and I knew God for Christ's sake had forgiven me all my sins." I asked whether her father (Dr. Annesley) had not the same faith; and whether she had not heard him preach it to others. She answered, he had it himself; and declared, a little before his death, that for more than forty years he had no darkness, no fear, no doubt at all of his being "accepted in the Beloved." But that, nevertheless, she did not remember to have heard him preach, no, not once, explicitly upon it: whence she supposed he also looked upon it as the peculiar blessing of a few; not as promised to all the people of God.' There was, in fact, within the Church of England comparatively little sense of God as vitally concerned in the religion of the individual. For this the subtle influence of Deism was doubtless responsible in a measure. William Warburton († 1779), Bishop of Gloucester, could write his *Divine Legation of Moses* against the Deists, and, at the same time, proceed even more forcibly against the Methodists in his *Doctrine of Grace, or the Office and Operations of the Holy Spirit vindicated from the insults of infidelity and the abuses of fanaticism*. In social and political circles, also, the 'superior knowledge' which was held to be assumed by those who professed assurance of sins forgiven, was condemned on all sides. Wesley in his *Journal* (June 25, 1745) calls attention to a former notorious character, Edward Greenfield by name, who was arrested for no other reason than his 'unbearable impudence' in making such a profession. Assurance as the privilege of *all* believers was, moreover, denied by 'most of the serious Dissenters,'[1] Doddridge, in his sermon on 'The Witness of the Spirit,'

[1] *Minutes of the Methodist Conference*, 1747.

being careful to confine such a witness to the elect. Within the Methodist Societies belief in this doctrine rapidly developed from an early date. In 1742 Wesley records of John Nelson, one of his preachers (*Journal*, May 25): 'His relations and acquaintance soon began to inquire what he thought of this new faith; and whether he believed there was any such thing as a man's knowing that his sins were forgiven: John told them point-blank, that this new faith, as they called it, was the old faith of the Gospel; and that he himself was as sure his sins were forgiven, as he could be of the shining of the sun.'[1] Thus, according to Nelson, Assurance was essentially part of 'the old faith of the Gospel,' and, at the Conference of 1788, Wesley stated that in the course of the previous fifty years he was not conscious that the Methodists had varied from the doctrine of the Church of England in any particular.[2]

Wesley describes the Witness of the Spirit as 'an inward impression on the soul of believers, whereby the Spirit of God directly[3] testifies to their spirit that they are the children of God.' It is a perfect understanding between the Holy Spirit and the human conscience. In Wesley's view, this is an *immediate* experience, involving no guarantee of final perseverance; and it was largely because the Assurance held out by Calvinism did involve some such guarantee that he came to discontinue the use of the term 'Assurance' as being apt to mislead. He makes it clear that this Witness is not *necessarily* connected with justifying faith, but rather is a *privilege* which every believer should pray for and expect to receive.[4] True, he once exclaims, 'I know not how any one can be a Christian believer till he "hath (as St. John speaks) the witness in himself"';[5] so that, if Assurance was not necessary to his own salvation, it certainly proved necessary to his own expression of it.

[1] See also the entry under June 5 of the same year.

[2] According to Bishop Gore (*The Holy Spirit and the Church*, pp. 147 f.), since 'we are assured by a Divine guarantee' that we have received the Spirit objectively through the sacraments, we may rely on that 'while the joy of responsive action comes or goes.' We continue to be 'sharers in Christ, knowing by an outward sign that we are so.' Here, indeed, may be a 'form of godliness' without the power. This is a form of Assurance which seems to need still further safeguarding.

[3] On 'directly,' see Pope, *Compendium*, iii. pp. 128 f.

[4] 'Certainly faith may exist without Assurance.'—*Ibid.*, p. 124.

[5] *Sermon* 'On the Trinity' (1775).

In the Methodist system the doctrine of the Witness of the Spirit follows naturally from the doctrine of salvation by faith.[1] Seeing that faith is a living act of the whole personality, every saved person may be privileged with the consciousness of that salvation which has been given by God in response to it. If God henceforth is really Father, this surely presupposes a filial relation which may be consciously experienced. 'This is confirmed,' says Wesley, 'not only by the experience of the children of God; thousands of whom can declare that they never did know themselves to be in the favour of God, till it was directly witnessed to them by His Spirit;—but by all those who are convinced of sin, who feel the wrath of God abiding on them. These cannot be satisfied with anything less than a direct testimony from His Spirit, that He is "merciful to their unrighteousness, and remembers their sins and iniquities no more." . . . And which way can these souls possibly be comforted, but by a Divine testimony, not that they are good, or sincere, or conformable to the Scripture in heart and life, but that God justifieth the ungodly?'[2] Wesley further speaks of the reception of the Spirit of adoption and of His inward witness as being instantaneous at the moment of conversion in the case of those who heard St. Peter's preaching.[3] The inference is that the experience itself is possible for *all*.[4] 'The manner how the Divine testimony is manifested to the heart I do not take upon me to explain. . . . But the fact we know,' as surely as when one is aware of the shining of the sun when standing 'in the full blaze of his beams.' Such a testimony 'may be clearly and solidly distinguished from the presumption of a natural mind, and from the delusion of the devil,' in this manner: 'The Scriptures describe that joy in the Lord which accompanies the witness of His Spirit as a humble joy, a joy that abases in the dust. . . . There is a soft, yielding spirit; a

1 In *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection*, Wesley upholds a Witness of the Spirit as to the believer's 'entire sanctification' as also to his justification previously, quoting 1 Cor. ii. 12, and 1 John v. 19.

2 *Second Sermon* on 'The Witness of the Spirit.'

3 *Sermon* on 'Scriptural Christianity.'

4 'To the enjoyment of this most comfortable privilege, the Methodists believe there can be no exception, unless in some extraordinary cases, occasioned by extreme ignorance, the influence of bodily complaints, or the violence of temptation.'—Crowther, *Hist. of the Wesleyan Methodists*.

mildness and sweetness, a tenderness of soul, which words cannot express. But do these fruits attend the supposed testimony of the Spirit in a presumptuous man? Just the reverse. The more confident he is of the favour of God, the more is he lifted up. . . . The stronger witness he imagines himself to have, the more overbearing is he to all around him.' It is 'by the fruits which He hath wrought in your spirit' that 'you shall know the testimony of the Spirit of God.'[1] Furthermore, this testimony 'is inevitably destroyed, not only by the commission of any outward sin, or the omission of known duty, but by giving way to any inward sin; in a word, by whatever grieves the Holy Spirit of God.'[2] On the necessity of applying this test of 'fruits' Wesley is constantly emphatic. 'I lay it down as an undoubted truth,' he declares, 'the fruit of the Spirit is the witness of the Spirit.'[3] In the *Journal*, under date June 17, 1763, after recording a remarkable incident in the course of which certain men received this Witness, he observes, 'Their following behaviour plainly showed the reality of their profession.' Another entry, dated May 20, 1781, contains this reference to a Christian lady: 'Eleven years ago, she believed that God had cleansed her from all sin; and she showed that she had not believed in vain, by her holy and unblamable conversation.'[4] 'Two inferences,' Wesley concludes, 'may be drawn from the whole: The first, Let none ever presume to rest in any supposed testimony of the Spirit which is separate from the fruit of it. . . . The second inference is, Let none rest in any supposed fruit of the Spirit without the witness.'[5] Hence, he adds, '"being justified by faith" we taste of the heaven to which we are going; we are holy and happy; we tread down sin and fear, and "sit in heavenly places with

1 *First Sermon* on 'The Witness of the Spirit.'

2 *Second Sermon* on 'The Witness of the Spirit.' Cp. *Minutes of the Methodist Conference*, 1745: '*Q.* Is such an assurance absolutely necessary to inward and outward holiness? *A.* To inward, we apprehend it is: to outward holiness, we incline to think it is not.'

3 *Ibid.*

4 See Wesley's *Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion*, pt. i. iii. 6. William James, treating of Methodist teaching concerning conversion, remarks: 'If the *fruits for life* of the state of conversion are good, we ought to idealize and venerate it, even though it be a piece of natural psychology: if not, we ought to make short work with it, no matter what supernatural being may have infused it.'

5 *Second Sermon* on 'The Witness of the Spirit.'

Christ Jesus.'' '[1] 'Happy they who enjoy this clear and constant!'[2]

Salvation, it is clear, is not by feeling, but by faith, and the Witness of the Spirit is a witness to salvation by faith.[3] Whether 'feelings' follow, or not, is a matter entirely at the Divine discretion. Wesley's account of his reception of Assurance on that memorable evening in Aldersgate Street proceeds: 'But it was not long before the enemy suggested, "This cannot be faith; for where is thy joy?" Then was I taught that peace and victory over sin are essential to faith in the Captain of our salvation; but that, as to the transports of joy that usually attend the beginning of it, especially in those who have mourned deeply, God sometimes giveth, sometimes withholdeth them, according to the counsels of His own will.'[4] Instances of a perverted Assurance indeed appear in the course of the Methodist movement, such as when Wesley 'found about thirty of those who thought they were saved from sin had separated from their brethren.'[5] Horsley, with certain Methodists in mind, speaks of their 'unhappy peculiarity of temperament,' and of their faith as insufficiently endorsed by their works.[6] Yet aberrations of this kind, which were by no means confined to Methodists, should not be allowed to obscure the sanity of Wesley's doctrine, and his insistence on testing inward experience by the Bible, by the experience of the Church, and by the quality of outward action. 'The Christian experience,' as Dr. Percy Gardner has said, 'is the root alike of the Christian religion and the Christian Church'; [7] and to give it reality and certainty will always be the chief function of the religion of the Spirit.

1 *Plain Account of the People called Methodists.* See an interesting account in Wm. James, *V.R.E.*, ix., of the conversion in 1829 of Stephen H. Bradley.
2 *Notes on the N.T.* (Rom. viii. 16).
3 See C. W. Emmet, in *The Spirit*, &c., pp. 191 f.
4 See *A New History of Methodism*, ii. p. 427.
5 *Journal*, January 17, 1763.
6 *Tracts*, pp. 449 f.
7 *The Practical Basis of Christian Belief*, p. 181.

LIST OF PRINCIPAL AUTHORITIES

The Orthodox Confession of the Eastern Church (1643), (Schaff, *Creeds*, ii. pp. 275 ff.).

Gavin, Frank: *Greek Orthodox Thought* (1922).

Formula Concordiae (1577) (ed. 1578).

Canons of Dort (1619), (Schaff, *Creeds*, iii. pp. 550 ff.).

Arminius, Jacobus: *Thesis VI, de Sp. sanct.* (ed. 1629, Leyden).

Arminian *Remonstrance* (1610), (Schaff, *Creeds*, iii. pp. 545 ff.)

Episcopius, Simon: *Institutiones Theologicae* (ed. 1678).

Confession of the Remonstrants (1622).

Grotius, Hugo: *Annotationes in N.T.*, and *De veritate religionis Christianae.*

Curcellaeus, Stephen: *Institutio Religionis Christianae*, and *Prima Dissertatio Theologica de Vocibus Trinitatis.*

Limborch, Philip van: *Theologia Christiana* (1686).

Le Clerc, Jean: *Judgment of Dr. Clarke's Writings.*

Cameron, John: *Sermons* (ed. 1633, Geneva).

Amyraut, Moses: *De Mysterio Trinitatis* (ed. 1661).

Petavius, Dionysius: *De Trinitate.*

Hooker, Richard: *Ecclesiastical Polity* (ed. 1863, Keble, Oxon.).

Andrewes, Lancelot: *Responsio ad Cardinalis Bellarmini Apologiam*, and *Sermons on the Holy Spirit* (Anglo-Catholic Library, iii.).

Cartwright, Thomas: *Harmonia Evangelica* (ed. 1647).

Donne, John: *Sermons* (ed. 1640).

Irish Articles of Religion (1615), (Schaff, *Creeds*, iii. pp. 526 ff.).

Westminster Confession (1647), (Schaff, *ibid.*, pp. 647 ff.).

Sterry, Peter: *The Spirit's Conviction of Sin* (first ed. 1645).

Lightfoot, John: *Commentary on the Acts* (first ed. 1645).

Baxter, Richard: *Christian Directory* (first ed. 1673).

Chillingworth, William: *Religion of Protestants* (ed. 1845).

Cudworth, Ralph: *True Intellectual System of the Universe* (ed. 1845).

Pearson, John: *Exposition of the Creed.*

Barrow, Isaac: *A Defence of the Blessed Trinity* (ed. 1697).

Bunyan, John: *A Confession of my Faith, A Defence of the Doctrine of Justification by Faith in Jesus Christ*, and *Saved by Grace* (*Works*, ed. 1853, Blackie).

Owen, John : *A Brief Declaration and Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, and *Concerning the Holy Spirit* (ed. 1826).

Clagett, William : *A Discourse concerning the Operations of the Holy Spirit* (second ed. 1680).

Beveridge, William : *Thesaurus Theologicus* (ed. 1816).

Bull, George : *Harmonia Apostolica* (ed. A.-C. Lib., 1842), and *Defensio Fidei Nicenae* (ed. do. 1851–5).

Sherlock, William : *A Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation* (first ed. 1690), *An Apology for Writing against Socinians in Defence of the Doctrines of the Holy Trinity and Incarnation* (first ed. 1693), and *A Defence of Dr. Sherlock's Notion of a Trinity in Unity* (first ed. 1694).

South, Robert : *Animadversions upon Dr. Sherlock's Book, entitled A Vindication of the Holy and Ever Blessed Trinity* (first ed. 1693).

Wallis, John : *The Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity* (first ed. 1693).

Howe, John : *A Calm and Sober Inquiry concerning the Possibility of a Trinity in the Godhead* (1694–5).

Anonymous : *The Distinction between Real and Nominal Trinitarians Examined, and the Doctrine of a Real Trinity vindicated from the Charge of Tritheism* (first ed. 1696).

Stillingfleet, Edward : *A Discourse in Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity* (first ed. 1697).

Henry, Matthew : *Exposition of the New Testament* (ed. 1838).

Clarke, Samuel : *The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity* (1712).

Edwards, John : *Some Animadversions on Dr. Clarke's Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity* (1712).

Gastrell, Francis : *Remarks upon Dr. Clarke's Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity* (1714).

Waterland, Daniel : *A Vindication of Christ's Divinity* (third ed. 1720), *A Second Vindication of Christ's Divinity* (first ed. 1723), and *A Farther Vindication of Christ's Divinity* (first ed. 1724).

Priestley, Joseph : *A History of the Corruptions of Christianity* (first ed. 1782).

Horsley, Samuel : *Tracts in Controversy with Dr. Priestley* (third ed. 1812).

Butler, Joseph : *The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature* (ed. 1844).

Bacon, Francis : *Confession of Faith* (ed. 1859, *Works*, vol. vii.) (ed. Spedding, &c., 1859).

Campbell, George : *A New Translation of the Four Gospels* (ed. 1789).

Barclay, Robert: *Catechism and Confession of Faith* (ed. 1690), and *An Apology for the True Christian Divinity* (ed. 1678).

Boehme, Jakob: *Aurora*, and *Three Principles of the Divine Essence* (translated by William Law) (ed. 1764, vol. i.).

Law, William: *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life* (ed. 1857).

Bengel, Johann Albrecht: *Gnomon Novi Testamenti* (ed. 1759).

Wesley, John: *Sermons, Notes on the New Testament, Journal*, and *Appeals to Men of Reason and Religion.*

Myles, William: *A Chronological History of the People called Methodists* (1813).

Crowther, Jonathan: *A Portraiture of Methodism, or the History of the Wesleyan Methodists* (1815).

Rigg, James H.: *The Churchmanship of John Wesley* (1878).

Pope, William Burt: *A Compendium of Christian Theology* (1879).

Young, Robert Newton: *The Witness of the Spirit* (1882).

Gregory, Benjamin: *A Handbook of Scriptural Church Principles and of Wesleyan Methodist Polity and History* (1888).

A New History of Methodism (1909), edited by Townsend, Workman, and Eayrs.

INDEX

I. Scripture References.

II. Persons.

III. Subjects.

I. SCRIPTURE REFERENCES

Genesis :
i. 2 .. 133*n*, 136*n*, 152 f, 207*n*, 224*n*, 291*n*
i. 3 .. 161
i. 26 .. 85
xi. 9 .. 215
Exodus :
iii. 14 .. 85
Leviticus :
xx. 8 .. 64
Deuteronomy :
vi. 4 .. 80, 85
Job :
xxvi. 13 .. 136*n*
xxxiii. 4 .. 136*n*, 154
Psalms :
xxxiii. 6 .. 136*n*
civ. 2 .. 161
civ. 30 .. 136*n*
cxxxix. 7 .. 136*n*
Proverbs :
xx. 27 .. 181
Isaiah :
xlv. 7 .. 161
Matthew :
iii. 13 ff .. 62*n*, 111*n*, 114*n*, 123, 211*n*
xii. 31 f .. 63, 66*n*, 136*n*
xvii. 4 .. 224
xviii. 19 f .. 227
xix. 17 .. 67
xxiii. 13–33 293*n*
xxiii. 15 .. 281
xxviii. 19 .. 66*n*, 111, 113, 114*n*, 119, 133, 136*n*, 137, 138*n*, 143, 245, 247
Mark :
iii. 5 .. 285*n*
xii. 32 .. 159
Luke :
i. 4 .. 200
i. 15 .. 114*n*
Luke : *cont.*
i. 35 .. 195
iii. 21 f .. 110, 113*n*, 245*n*
iv. 1 .. 294*n*
iv. 18 .. 114*n*
xi. 13 .. 177, 209, 294*n*, 309 f
xii. 5 .. 310
xii. 12 .. 136*n*
xxiv. 49 .. 64*n*
John :
i. 1 .. 57
i. 18 .. 112
iii. 5 .. 283
iii. 6 ff .. 281
iii. 11 .. 114*n*
iii. 25 .. 112
iv. 23 .. 114*n*
iv. 24 .. 94*n*
v. 23 .. 67
v. 32 .. 114*n*
vi. 53 ff .. 122*n*, 306*n*
vi. 56 .. 110, 244*n*, 290*n*, 291*n*, 306*n*
vi. 61 f .. 194*n*
vii. 39 .. 210
x. 30, 38 .. 112
xi. 21 .. 224
xiv. 12–19 123
xiv. 15 f .. 61, 62*n*, 133 f, 136, 185, 206*n*, 211*n*, 225, 291*n*
xiv. 17 .. 134, 185, 209, 225
xiv. 20 .. 111*n*, 291*n*
xiv. 21–27 .. 62*n*, 172*n*, 185, 207
xiv. 26 .. 62*n*, 111*n*, 123, 133, 136*n*, 169, 206, 207*n*, 291*n*, 292*n*
xv. 26 .. 83, 123 ff, 126, 133, 141*n*, 146, 173, 206, 210*n*
xvi. 7 .. 83, 206*n*, 208, 224*n*
xvi. 8 .. 133, 173*n*, 174*n*, 208, 292*n*

JOHN: *cont.*
xvi. 11 .. 207 f
xvi. 14 .. 83, 124
xvi. 13 ff. .. 86*n*, 112, 115*n*, 146 185
xvi. 16 .. 211*n*
xvi. 17 .. 137, 292
xvii. 3 .. 69
xvii. 17ff .. 293
xx. 22 f 123, 206*n*, 213 f

ACTS:
i. 16 .. 136*n*
ii. 1–4 .. 81*n*, 205*n*, 213*n*, 215 f, 224*n*, 227, 294*n*
ii. 22 .. 98
ii. 33 .. 100
ii. 38 .. 111, 246, 250*n*
v. 3 ff .. 60, 61*n*, 63 f, 68, 70, 136*n*, 137
v. 9 .. 137
vi. 7 .. 174*n*
viii. 17 .. 246
xiii. 3 f .. 136*n*
xiv. .. 217
xv. 9 .. 300
xvi. 7 .. 194*n*
xix. 2 .. 211*n*, 308
xx. 28 .. 136*n*
xxii. 16 .. 248 f.
xxviii. 25 f.. 136*n*

ROMANS:
v. 5 .. 112
viii. 9 .. 114*n*, 124, 126, 194*n*, 227, 238
viii. 11 .. 126
viii. 16 .. 138, 308, 310 f, 316
viii. 26 .. 135
viii. 27 86*n*
ix. 4 .. 114*n*
xi. 36 .. 113
xii. 2 .. 154
xiii. 14 .. 245
xvi. 27 .. 67

I CORINTHIANS:
ii. 10 f .. 86*n*, 112, 137, 143 f
ii. 12 .. 319*n*
ii. 14 .. 264
ii. 15 .. 187
iii. 16 .. 68, 136*n*
vi. 12 .. 227
vii. 12, 25 .. 172
viii. 6 .. 69
x. 16 .. 252
x. 23 .. 227
xi. 29 .. 253*n*
xii. 3 .. 111*n*, 291*n*
xii. 4–7 .. 35, 136*n*, 137
xii. 11 .. 136*n*, 137
xii. 13 .. 248
xiv. 11, 13, 27 f 215 f

II CORINTHIANS:
iii. 15 ff .. 135, 159*n*, 194*n*
v. 19 .. 89*n*
viii. 10 .. 227
xiii. 14 .. 136*n*, 247

GALATIANS:
ii. 20 .. 300
iii. 27 .. 248
iv. 6 .. 85, 124, 126, 194*n*, 209*n*, 293*n*

EPHESIANS:
i. 3 f .. 292*n*
i. 19 f .. 265
ii. 8 .. 264*n*
iii. 6 .. 114*n*
iv. 1–6 .. 230
iv. 3 .. 207
iv. 4 ff .. 35, 69
iv. 13 .. 239
iv. 17 f .. 264
iv. 23 .. 154
iv. 30 .. 135, 146*n*, 159*n*
v. 26 .. 123*n*

PHILIPPIANS:
i. 6 .. 265
i. 19 .. 194*n*

COLOSSIANS:
i. 15 .. 173
iii. 3 .. 310
iii. 4 .. 226

I TIMOTHY:
i. 17 .. 67
i. 19 .. 296
ii. 5 .. 98
iii. 1 .. 236

II TIMOTHY:
i. 7 .. 211
iii. 16 .. 176

TITUS:
i. 7 .. 236
iii. 5 .. 265

HEBREWS:
i. 1 f .. 114 *n*, 199
i. 3–6 .. 199
i. 8 f .. 57, 199
vi. 4 .. 114*n*, 296
vii. 26 .. 195
x. 29 .. 114*n*
xi. 6 .. 85
xii. 29 .. 285*n*
xiii. 12 .. 123*n*

I PETER:
i. 2 .. 114*n*
i. 10 f .. 126, 176, 194*n*
i. 21 f .. 293
iii. 18 .. 207

II PETER:
i. 20 f .. 136*n*, 176

JAMES:
i. 16 f .. 110*n*, 173, 206*n*

I JOHN :
i. 5 .. 161
iii. 16 .. 281
iii. 21 .. 312
iv. 2 .. 198
iv. 18 .. 310
v. 6 .. 206*n*
v. 7 (A.V.) .. 100*n*, 102, 104, 114, 115*n*, 132, 136*n*, 173, 178

I JOHN : *cont.*
v. 10 .. 225
v. 19 .. 319*n*
JUDE :
4 .. 296
REVELATION :
i. 4 .. 226
i. 5 .. 281*n*
vi. 16 .. 285*n*

II. PERSONS

Amyraut, 19, 60 f, 79, 122*n*, 263, 290
Andreae, 17
Andrewes, 20, 61, 81, 110, 123, 133, 205 f, 223 f, 245, 291
Androutsos, 223*n*
Annesley, Dr., 317
Aquinas, 71, 131
Aristotle, 21, 152, 175
Arminius, 14, 17, 57, 110, 120, 132, 151, 205, 248, 271, 290, 305
Arnauld, Antoine, 45, 243*n*, 269
Arnold, 15
Asbury, Francis, 233
Athanasius, 99
Atmore, Charles, 234*n*
Augustine, 45 f, 75

Bacon, Francis, 21, 36, 41, 101, 156, 182, 211, 282
Bacon, Roger, 22, 79
Balfour, Earl of, 188*n*
Barclay, Robert, 47, 102, 184 f, 201, 212, 229, 244*n*, 269 f, 283 f, 286, 295 f, 301, 315
Barnes, Bishop, 188
Barratt, Principal T. H., 253*n*
Barrow, Isaac, 23, 84, 279, 292, 294, 307
Baxter, Richard, 14, 21, 82*n*, 134, 174 f, 292, 306 f
Beet, Dr. J. Agar, 136*n*, 229*n*, 237*n*
Bellarmine, 92, 122*n*
Bengel, 14, 50, 104, 114 f, 126, 186
Berkeley, Bishop, 42 f, 157, 160 ff, 182
Beveridge, William, 24, 64, 85, 112, 124 f, 209 f, 293
Beza, 17, 174
Biddle, John, 23, 134
Boehme, 21, 49, 70, 103 f, 126, 144 f, 157 ff, 186, 284 f, 296
Böhler, Peter, 285
Bossuet, 19, 47
Bourne, Cardinal, 238
Bradburn, Samuel, 234
Brayshaw, A. N., 48
Brigden, T. E., 233*n*, 235*n*
Browne, Simon, 32
Bull, Bishop, 25, 64 f, 138*n*, 140, 209 f, 281, 294, 310
Bunyan, 23, 64, 84*n*, 112, 136, 212, 264, 279, 292, 307 f
Burnet, Bishop, 22
Butler, Bp. Joseph, 38, 51, 70, 114, 139*n*, 145, 154, 180 f, 228, 266 f, 282 f, 313 f, 316

Cairns, Principal D. S., 163
Calvin, 245, 251 f
Cameron, 18, 110, 122*n*, 194, 244, 263, 290 f, 306
Campbell, George, 43, 182, 211, 283
Cappel, 18, 171
Cartwright, Thomas, 20, 62, 110, 123 f, 172, 206, 245
Chase, Thomas, 47*n*
Chemnitz, 17, 260*n*, 262
Chillingworth, 13, 16, 20 f, 82, 124, 172, 208, 225 f, 307
Clagett, 24 f, 177, 185, 209, 265 f, 280 f, 293*n*, 309 f
Clarke, Adam, 53
Clarke, Samuel, 14, 30 ff, 37, 66 ff, 95 ff, 142 f, 178 f, 196, 268*n*
Clarke, Dr. W. N., 94 f, 115 f, 144*n*, 146, 229*n*
Clayton, Robert, 35
Cohu, J. R., 235*n*
Coke, Dr. Thomas, 232 ff
Cownley, Joseph, 234*n*
Cowper, 53
Creighton, James, 235
Crell, 61, 67, 135, 311
Crowther, Jonathan, 35, 104*n*, 201*n*, 248*n*, 250, 254, 271*n*, 316*n*, 319*n*
Cudworth, 16, 22, 43, 62, 82 f, 152 f, 159 f, 175, 207
Curcellaeus, 18, 59 f, 77, 121
Cyprian, 230, 237

Daillé, 18
Denney, Dr. James, 229*n*, 272*n*
Descartes, 37, 39, 45, 154 f, 181, 267
Doddridge, 53, 317*n*
Donne, 20, 62, 111, 133, 206 f, 213, 224*n*, 291, 306

Dositheus, 17, 259*n*, 277
Dougall, Miss L., 213*n*
Driver, Prof. S. R., 161
Drummond, H. G., 48*n*, 49*n*, 201*n*, 284*n*
Duns Scotus, 36
Durandus, 131

Edwards, John, 30, 67 f, 196
Edwards, Jonathan, 42*n*, 43, 182, 269, 272*n*, 294*n*, 314*n*
Emmet, C. W., 131*n*, 188*n*, 252*n*, 309*n*, 321*n*
Epiphanius, 99
Episcopius, 18, 57 f, 76 f, 120 f, 132, 262, 290, 305
Erasmus, 58
Erdmann, Prof. J. E., 41, 101, 144, 156*n*, 157*n*, 186*n*, 228*n*, 268, 284*n*
Erigena, 22, 152

Fénelon, 47, 226*n*, 295
Fichte, J. G., 41, 268
Fisher, Prof. G. P., 268, 269*n*, 271, 294*n*
Flacius, 260
Fowler, Bishop, 279*n*
Fox, George, 47, 184, 212, 295
Francke, 50, 186
Freeman, James, 35
Froude, J. A., 36*n*, 40, 155, 267

Gardner, Dr. Percy, 75, 109, 111*n*, 188, 214, 259*n*, 321
Gastrell, 31, 68, 95 f, 142
Gavin, Dr. Frank, 17, 119*n*, 120*n*, 132, 169, 223*n*, 237*n*, 244*n*, 245*n*, 251*n*, 259*n*, 305*n*
Gerhohus, 193
Gibbon, 34, 122*n*, 213*n*
Goethe, 44, 155*n*
Gore, Bishop, 54, 136*n*, 156*n*, 231*n*, 250*n*, 285*n*, 318*n*
Green, John Richard, 53*n*
Greenfield, Edward, 317
Gregory, J. R., 224*n*, 232*n*
Grotius, 16, 18, 121, 311
Guyon, Madame, 46 f, 295
Gwatkin, Prof. H. M., 164, 238

Hadfield, Dr. J. A., 54*n*, 218, 297*n*
Hallam, 20*n*
Hammond, 16
Hare, 15, 136*n*
Harnack, 15, 17, 45*n*, 110, 278*n*
Heber, 15
Henry, Matthew, 29, 65 f, 94, 113*n*, 141*n*, 210 f, 213 f, 247, 281, 292*n*, 293 f
Herbert of Cherbury, Lord, 25, 37
Herle, Charles, 228
Hermogenes, 152

Hilary, 58
Hobbes, 21 f, 25 f, 37, 41 f, 101, 157, 228*n*, 268
Hoffman, Daniel, 36
Hooker, 20, 80 ff, 153*n*, 171 f, 194, 196, 244, 306
Horsley, 25*n*, 34, 36*n*, 44, 70, 99 f, 120*n*, 179 f, 182, 197 ff, 282, 313, 321
Howe, 16, 25*n*, 27 f, 29*n*, 40*n*, 43, 93, 141*n*, 155, 196, 227 f, 294, 311
Hume, 40, 43, 52, 268, 294*n*
Huss, 194

Ignatius, 198, 236 f
Inge, Dean, 21*n*, 22, 44*n*, 46*n*, 49*n*, 136*n*, 144*n*, 156*n*, 186*n*, 285*n*, 315*n*
Ishii, Tokichi, 273*n*

Jackson, John, 30, 31*n*, 32
Jackson, Thomas, 20
Jacobi, 41
James II, King, 25
James, William, 189*n*, 269*n*, 273, 278*n*, 282*n*, 285*n*, 314, 320*n*, 321*n*
Jansen, 45 f, 269
Jeremias, 243*n*, 259*n*
Jerome, 247

Kant, 40, 41*n*, 43, 268
Keckermann, 36
Keith, Sir Arthur, 300*n*
Kilham, Alexander, 234*n*
King, Lord, 233
Kritopoulos, 305
Kübel, 49

Lange, 50, 186
Law, William, 38, 50*n*, 158, 270 f, 285*n*, 286, 296 f
Lawrence, Brother, 46, 217 f, 294 f
Le Clerc, 18, 30, 60, 78 f, 122
Leibnitz, 40, 101, 156 f, 159, 163, 182, 268
Leo XIII, Pope, 238
Leslie, Charles, 38
Lessing, 40
Lidgett, Dr. J. Scott, 53*n*
Lightfoot, John, 21, 111, 134, 144, 174, 213, 215, 246
Limborch, 18, 60, 77 f, 110, 122, 132 f, 170 f, 263, 277 f, 290, 305
Lindsey, Theophilus, 32
Locke, 26*n*, 29, 37, 39, 42 f, 268
Lodge, Sir Oliver, 161 ff, 300*n*
Lucar, 17
Luther, 110, 259, 278, 284

Malebranche, 182
Mather, Alexander, 235
Mayhew, Jonathan, 35
Melanchthon, 131, 141, 259
Middleton, Conyers, 39*n*

Milner, Isaac, 53
Milner, Joseph, 53
Moberly, Prof. R. C., 57, 76, 194*n*, 231*n*, 262, 289*n*
Mogilas, 17
Molinos, 46 f, 183, 269, 295
Moore, Henry, 234*n*, 235
More, Henry, 22
Morgan, Thomas, 37
Moulton, Prof. James Hope, 216 f
Müller, Heinrich, 50, 186
Murray, Prof. Gilbert, 188*n*
Musäus, Johann, 50
Myers, F. W. H., 188
Myles, William, 233*n*

Nelson, John, 318
Nelson, Robert, 31
Newton, John, 53
Nicolas of Cusa, 141

Origen, 152, 185
Orr, Dr. James, 41*n*, 57*n*, 271
Orton, Job, 35 f
Otto, Prof. Rudolf, 51*n*, 185, 188*n*, 212*n*, 273, 282, 284, 315*n*
Owen, John, 14, 16, 23 f, 64, 84, 112, 124, 136 ff, 153 f, 156, 175 ff, 185, 194 f, 208 f, 226 f, 246 f, 264 ff, 280, 292 f, 308 ff

Pajon, 19, 263
Paley, 43
Pascal, 45, 269
Paton, J. L., 131*n*
Pearson, 16, 23, 62 f, 83 f, 124, 134 ff, 175, 226, 292, 307
Penn, William, 47, 48*n*
Perkins, William, 18
Petavius, 19, 61, 79, 122*n*, 133
Peter the Lombard, 77, 81, 205
Photius, 61
Pius, IX, 194*n*
Plato, 22, 62, 152
Plautus, 216, 292*n*
Plotinus, 175
Plutarch, 152 f
Poiret, Pierre, 47
Pope, Dr. W. B., 16*n*, 33*n*, 36*n*, 37*n*, 38, 41*n*, 52*n*, 183, 201*n*, 230*n*, 244*n*, 250*n*, 254 f, 268, 271*n*, 272*n*, 289*n*, 290, 301, 318*n*
Pordage, John, 50*n*
Priestley, 14, 23*n*, 33 f, 70, 98 ff, 143 f, 154, 179, 197 ff, 247, 281
Pringle-Pattison, Prof., 45, 162

Radbertus, 251
Rankin, Thomas, 235
Rathmann, Hermann, 170*n*
Reid, Thomas, 43
Richard of St. Victor, 104
Rigg, Dr. James, H., 53*n*, 233*n*, 234, 249, 252, 285*n*, 316*n*
Robinson, Canon A. W., 213*n*
Rogers, Henry, 25, 28, 93*n*, 155*n*, 228, 294*n*, 311*n*
Romaine, 53
Rousseau, 52
Rutherford, Prof. Sir Ernest, 160 f

St. Cyres, Viscount, 45*n*, 47, 314*n*
St. Juan of the Cross, 46
St. Teresa, 46
Sancroft, 224
Sanday and Headlam, Drs., 113*n*
Schleiermacher, 41
Schwenkfeld, 49
Scott, Prof. C. Anderson, 147*n*, 215 f, 231*n*
Seeley, Sir John R., 239
Seneca, 207
Sherlock, Bp. Thomas, 264*n*, 311 ff
Sherlock, Dean, 24 ff, 65, 85 ff, 112, 125 f, 138 ff, 160, 178, 195 f, 210
Simeon, Charles, 53
Simon, Dr. John S., 31*n*, 51*n*, 232*n*, 249*n*
Smith, John, 22, 307
South, 26 ff, 87 ff, 126, 138 ff, 157, 195 f, 311
Spangenberg, 50 f, 315
Spener, 49 f, 52*n*, 186, 285
Spinoza, 36, 39 f, 40*n*, 49, 155, 181 f, 267, 282
Sterry, Peter, 18, 21, 23*n*, 133 f, 151 f, 173 ff, 207, 224 f, 279, 292
Stillingfleet, 24 f, 26*n*, 28 f, 37, 42, 60, 65, 90 ff, 113, 141, 178, 233
Stuart, Moses, 35
Swedenborg, 48, 102 f, 144, 157 f, 160, 185 f, 201*n*, 270, 284
Swete, Prof. H. B., 58*n*, 119*n*, 213*n*, 232*n*, 236 ff
Swift, Dean, 35, 114

Taylor, Jeremy, 20
Tenison, 224
Tertullian, 197, 236 f
Tholuck, 46
Thorndike, 20
Tillotson, 22
Tindal, 37 f, 154
Toland, 37
Toplady, 271
Townsend, Dr. W. J., 51*n*

Underhill, Evelyn, 46*n*
Ussher, 21, 224

Vasey, Thomas, 235
Venn, Henry, 53
Venn, John, 53
Voltaire, 39, 52

Wadding, 194*n*
Walker, Dr. W. L., 127, 144*n*, 147*n*, 163, 193*n*
Wallis, John, 14, 26 f, 81, 91 f, 139*n*
Warburton, Bp. William, 317
Warren, 29, 94, 126
Waterhouse, Prof. E. S., 76*n*, 131*n*, 162 ff, 188
Waterland, 30 ff, 68 f, 96 ff, 113, 143, 154*n*, 179
Watson, Richard, 53
Watts, Isaac, 33
Wells, Edward, 31
Wenyon, Dr. Charles, 219
Wesley, Charles, 145, 201, 212, 233
Wesley, John, 29, 35, 43, 48*n*, 50 ff, 70, 104 f, 114 f, 126, 145 f, 158 f, 186, 212, 214, 218, 230 ff, 244, 248 ff, 252 ff, 271 ff, 284*n*, 292*n*, 297 ff, 312 f
Wesley, Mrs. (senr.), 317
Wetstein, 171
Whatcoat, Richard, 234 f
Whiston, William, 14, 30, 31*n*, 67
Whitby, Daniel, 30, 271*n*
Whitgift, 224
Wilberforce, William, 53
Winer, Prof. G. B., 223*n*, 236*n*, 243*n*, 259*n*
Wiseman, F. L., 145*n*
Wolff, 40, 156*n*, 182, 268
Workman, Dr. H. B., 52, 233*n*, 296*n*

Young, Dr. R. Newton, 307*n*, 310*n*, 311*n*

Zinzendorf, 50 f
Zoernikau, 120
Zwingli, 251

III. SUBJECTS

Analogy, method of, in discussing the Trinity—as used by Augustine 75 ; psychological, 75 f, 87 f, 94, 98, 103
Antinomianism, 50*n*, 286
Arminianism, 14, 17 f, 30, 35, 57 ff, 70, 77 f, 120 ff, 132 f, 170 f, 223, 245, 251, 262 f, 271, 277 ff, 290, 305
Assurance, see *Witness of the Spirit*
Athanasian Creed, 98, 115

Baptism, the Holy Spirit in, in the Greek Church 245, English Protestantism 245 f, Lightfoot 246, Henry 247, Priestley 247, Wesley and early Methodism 248 ff, the Church of England 249

Cabbalists, 186*n*
Calvinism, 261 ff, 269, 271, 289, 305 f, 313, 318
Cartesianism, 39*n*
Church, the Holy Spirit and the, in Roman, Greek, Reformed, and Arminian teaching 223, Andrewes 223 f, Sterry 224 f, Chillingworth 225 f, Owen 226 f, Howe 227 f, Butler 228, Quaker teaching 229, Wesley and early Methodism 230 ff
Concord, Formula of, 17, 76, 120, 170, 193, 260 ff
Confirmation, 245 ff
Constantinople, Creed of, 121
Creation, the Holy Spirit in, in Arminius 151, Sterry 151 f, Cudworth 152 f, Owen 153 f, Butler 154, Spinoza 155, Howe 155, Leibnitz 156 f, 159, Francis Bacon 156, South 157, Berkeley 157, Swedenborg 157 f, Boehme 157 ff, Law 158, Wesley 158 f ; modern views on (App. Note), 160 ff

Deism, 36 ff, 53, 154, 180, 266, 313, 317
Didaché, 236
Dort, Canons of, 76, 261 ff, 289 f, 306*n* ; Decrees of, 17
Dove, use of the figure of the, 138*n*

Easter Gift of the Holy Spirit, 213 f
Epistles of Ignatius, 236
Eucharist, the Holy Spirit in the, in the Greek, Roman, and Reformed Churches 251, Arminianism 251, Westminster Confession 252, Wesley 252 ff, the Church of England 252, early Methodism 254

Filioque clause, 14 ; Eastern and Western difference on, 14 f, 57*n*, 119 ff, 122, 125, 127, 205

Godhead of the Holy Spirit, in Arminius 57, Episcopius 57 ff, Curcellaeus 59 f, Limborch 60, Saumur and Roman Catholic theology 60 f, Andrewes 61, Donne 62, Cartwright 62, Irish Artt. and Westminster Conf. 62, Pearson 62 f, Owen 64, Beveridge 64, Bunyan 64, Bull 64 f, Sherlock 65, Henry 65 f, Clarke 66 ff, John Edwards 67 f, Gastrell 68, Waterland 68 f, Priestley 70, Horsley 70, Boehme 70, Butler 70, Wesley 70

Grace, prevenient, 259 ff, 272, 280
Greek Church, the theology of the, 17, 57, 75, 119, 123, 125, 132, 151, 163, 169, 194*n*, 223, 229, 243, 245, 251, 277, 289, 305

Healing, spiritual, 217 ff
Holy Spirit, attacks on the Deity of the, 24, 32 f, 35, 66 f, 98, 142, 144; attacks on the Personality of the, 24, 33, 43, 139*n*, 141, 143 f; gift of the, before Pentecost 213 f
Humanism, 21

Illuminati, the, 314
Immanence, Divine, 161 ff
Incarnation, the Holy Spirit in the, in the Formula of Concord 193, Roman Catholicism 193 f, Saumur theology 194, Hooker 194, Owen 194 f, Sherlock 195 f, Clarke 196, John Edwards 196, Priestley 197 ff, Horsley 197 ff, Barclay 201, Swedenborgianism 201, early Methodism 201
Inner light, Platonist doctrine of the, 22; Quaker doctrine of the, 47, 183 f, 212, 229, 269 f, 283, 314 f
Inspiration, the Holy Spirit in, in the Greek Church 169, the Formula of Concord 170, Limborch 170 f, Hooker 171 f, Chillingworth 172, the Westminster Conf. 173, Sterry 173 f, Lightfoot 174, Baxter 174 f, Cudworth 175, Pearson 175, Owen 175 ff, Clagett 177, Sherlock 178, Horsley, 179 f, Butler 180 f, Descartes 181, Berkeley 182, Campbell 182, Barclay 184 f, Swedenborg 185 f, Boehme 186, Pietism 186, early Methodism 186
Intellect, operations of the Holy Spirit on the, 19, 169, 186, 263, 290, 306, 310
Irish Articles, 21, 62, 82

Jansenism, 45 f, 243*n*, 269, 295
Jerusalem, Synod of, 17
Jesuits, 46
Justification, the Holy Spirit in, in the Roman and Greek Churches 277, Arminianism 277 f, Reformed teaching 278, the Westminster Conf. 278, Sterry 279, Barrow 279, Bunyan 279, Owen 280, Clagett 280 f, Priestley 281, Spinoza 282, Francis Bacon 282, Butler 282 f, Barclay and Quakerism 283 f, Swedenborg 284, Boehme 284 f, Pietism and Moravian teaching 285, Wesley 285 f

Latitudinarians, 20 f, 36
Logos, the, 197 ff
Lord's Supper, the, see *Eucharist*

Methodism, 53, 71, 104, 145 f, 186, 201, 212, 230 ff, 234 f, 244, 248 ff, 254, 271 ff, 285 f, 297 ff; also see *John Wesley* (Index, § ii)
Mission of the Holy Spirit, the, in Andrewes 205 f, Donne 206 f, Sterry 207, Cudworth 207, Owen 208 f, Clagett 209, Beveridge 209 f, Bull 210, Sherlock 210, Henry 210 f, Francis Bacon 211, Campbell 211, Barclay 212, early Methodism 212
Monergism, 260
Moravian Church, rise of the, 50, 285 f
Mysticism, place for, 44; dangers of, 44 f, 52 f; the Trinity in, 101 ff; on the Creator Spirit 157; on the inspiring Spirit, 183 ff; on the Incarnation, 200 f; on the freedom of the will 269 f; on Justification, 283 f, 286; on Sanctification, 294 ff; on the Witness of the Spirit, 314 f

Natural Religion, 37; its relation to Revelation, 40
New-England theology, 42*n*, 268 f
Nicaea, Council of, 98; Creed of, 121

Ordination, validity of, 226, 228, 232 ff, 236 ff; by imposition of hands, in Lightfoot 246, early Methodism 234 f

Patripassianism, 89*n*, 195 f; see *Swedenborg*, 284*n*
Pelagianism 263 ff, 271; Semi-Pelagianism, 263, 265
Pentecost, see *Tongues*
Perfection, see *Sanctification*, especially 299 f
Personal Life of the Holy Spirit, in the Mediaeval Church 131, Arminius 132, Episcopius 132, Limborch 132 f, Andrewes 133, Donne 133, Sterry 133 f, Baxter 134, Pearson 134 ff, Owen 136 ff, Sherlock 138 f, South 139 f, Stillingfleet 141, Clarke 142 f, Waterland 143, Priestley 143 f, Boehme 144 f, early Methodism 145 f
Philosophy, relation to theology, 36, 43 f; continental, 39 ff; British, 41 ff; American, 42*n*; revolt against Scholasticism, 39 ff
Pietism, 49 ff, 186, 285, 296
Platonists, Cambridge, 21; on the Trinity, 22, 82 f; on Inspiration, 175

Platonism, 152, 198 f
Procession of the Holy Spirit, the, in the Greek Church 119 f, the Formula of Concord 120, Arminius 120, Episcopius 120 f, Grotius 121, Curcellaeus 121, Le Clerc 122, Andrewes 123, Cartwright 123 f, Pearson 124, Owen 124, Beveridge 124 f, Sherlock 125 f, South 126, Warren 126, Boehme 126, Bengel 126, Wesley 126 ; importance of the doctrine of, 127
Psychology, 54, 188 f, 215 f, 285*n*, 320*n*

Quakerism, 47 f, 101 f, 183 ff, 200 f, 211 f, 229, 244, 283 f, 286, 295 f, 314 f
Quietism, 46 f, 183, 269, 283, 295, 314

Rationalism, see *Deism*, *Natural Religion*, *Philosophy*
Reformers, the, 13, 109 f, 169, 213, 223, 251, 278
Regeneration, see Chapters XIII and XIV
Remonstrance, Arminian, 17 f, 262, 277, 290
Remonstrants, Confession of the, 18, 59, 170, 245*n*, 251*n*, 263*n*, 277
Roman Catholic theology, 19, 60 f, 79, 122*n*, 133, 169, 193 f, 213, 223, 229, 243, 245, 251, 259, 277, 289, 305

Sacraments, the Holy Spirit in the, in the Greek and Roman Churches 243 f, in Quaker teaching 244, in Methodism 244. See *Baptism* and *Eucharist*, also Note 2, p. 285
Sanctification, the Holy Spirit in, in the Greek and Roman Churches 289, the Canons of Dort 289 f, Arminianism 290, Saumur theology 290 f, Andrewes 291, Donne 291, Pearson 292, Barrow 292, Bunyan 292, Owen 292 f, Beveridge 293, Henry 293 f, Bull 294, Howe 294, Brother Lawrence 294 f, Quietism 295, Barclay and Quaker teaching 295 f, 301, Pietism 296, Law 296 f, Wesley and early Methodism 297 ff
Sardica, Council of, 98
Saumur theology, 18 f, 60 f, 79, 122*n*, 171, 194, 244, 263, 290 f, 306
Scriptures, the, evidential value of, 15 f, 169 f, 178 f, 184 ; authority of, attacked by Spinoza 40, 181, by the Unitarians 179, by the Deists 180, by the Quietists, 183 ; testimony of, to the Deity of the Holy Spirit 59 f, 63 ff, 68 f ; to the Trinity 77, 83 ff, 111 ; to the Procession 120 ff ; to the Personality of the Holy Spirit, 132 ff
Sin, the unpardonable, 66
Swedenborgianism, 48 f, 102 f. 185 f, 201, 270, 284
Synergism, 260 ff

Thirty-nine Articles, 21
Tongues, gift of, 215 ff, 246
Tradition, Roman teaching on, 169 f, Quaker teaching on, 184
Transubstantiation, 243, 251
Trinitarians, Real and Nominal, 25, 28, 65, 89 ff
Trinity, doctrine of, as held by the Cambridge Platonists 22, the Quakers 24, the Arminians 30 ; mutual-consciousness theory of, 26 f, 65, 85 ff, 94, 112, 140, 196 ; attacks of philosophers on, 26 ; attacks of Unitarians on, 23 ff, 29 ff, 35, 81, 91 f ; subordination in, see Chapter II, and 76 ff
Trinity, doctrine of the Absolute, in Episcopius 76 f, Curcellaeus 77, Limborch 77 f, Le Clerc 78 f, Petavius 79, Amyraut 79, Hooker 80 ff, Andrewes 81 f, Irish Artt. and Westminster Conf. 82, Cudworth 82 f, Pearson 83 f, Barrow 84, Owen 84, Beveridge 85, Sherlock 85 ff, South 87 ff, Stillingfleet 90 f, Howe 93, Warren 94, Clarke 95 ff, Gastrell 95 f, Waterland 96 ff, Priestley 98 ff, Horsley 99 f, Francis Bacon 101, Hobbes, 101, Leibnitz 101, Barclay 102, Swedenborg 102 f, Boehme 103 f, Bengel 104, Methodism 104
Trinity, doctrine of the Redemptive, in Arminius 110 f, Andrewes 110, Donne 111, Lightfoot 111, Bunyan 112, Owen 112, Sherlock 112, Stillingfleet 113, Butler 114, Wesley 114 f
Tritheism, charged against Sherlock, 28

Unitarianism, rise of, 23 f, 25*n* ; in the Early Church as Arianism, 98 ff; in America, 35 ; in Ireland, 35 f
Unity of God, stress on the, 65, 70, 76 ff, 80 ff, 84 f, 88 f, 91 ff, 95 f, 100, 104 f, 114, 141, 151, 153, 157 ff, 195 f, 205, 247

Westminster Confession, 21, 62, 124, 151, 173, 245 f, 250*n*, 252, 263 f, 278, 291, 306
Will, the Holy Spirit and the human, in the Greek and Roman Churches 259, Reformed teaching 259 f, the Formula of Concord 260 ff, the Canons of Dort 261 ff, Arminianism 262 f, Saumur Theology 263, the Westminster Conf. 263 f, Bunyan 264, Owen 264 ff, Clagett 265 f, Deism 266, Butler 266 f, Descartes 267, Spinoza 267, Leibnitz 268, Wolff 268, Kant 268, Fichte 268, Hobbes 268, Hume 268, Locke 268, Jonathan Edwards 269, Jansenism 269, Quietism 269, Quaker teaching 269 f, Swedenborg 270, Law 270 f, Wesley and early Methodism 271 ff
Witness of the Spirit, the, views of the Roman and Greek Churches 305, in Arminianism 305, Calvinism and the Westminster Confession 305 f, Cameron 306, Donne 306, Baxter 306 f, the Cambridge Platonists 307, Pearson 307, Barrow 307, Bunyan 307 f, Owen 308 ff, Clagett 309 f, Bull 310, South 311, Howe 311, Bp. Sherlock 311 ff, Horsley 313, Butler 313 f; Mysticism and Quaker teaching 314 f, Spangenberg 315, Wesley 312 f, 315 ff, Anglicanism 309 f, 316 ff, Dissent 317, early Methodism 317 ff

DR. K. STEVE McCORMICK
EUROPEAN NAZARENE Bible College
POSTFACH 109
CH-8201 SCHAFFHAUSEN, SWITZERLAND